

THE

OCTOBER 1956

CLASSICAL  
JOURNAL

THE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS, 1956

The Classics in the Twentieth Century

Gerald F. Else 1

Propertius 2. 26

Martha C. Heath 9

THE FORUM

Margaret M. Forbes 10

Three Versions of R. L. Stevenson's *Requiem*

Harry C. Schnur 14

Changing Objectives and Procedures in  
Teaching Latin, 1556-1956

George E. Ganss, S.J. 15

Some Latin Elegiacs

Harry C. Schnur 22

WE SEE BY THE PAPERS

Graves H. Thompson 23

Catullus: *Nulli se dicit mulier*

Roy A. Swanson 26

Livius Drusus, t. p. 122, and his Anti-Gracchan Program

Henry C. Boren 27

Lucretius 1. 1-25

Rolfe Humphries 36

Significant Action in the *Symposium*

Roger Hornsby 37

BOOK REVIEWS

Fred W. Householder, Jr. 41

*The First Philosophers* (Thomson)

Kevin Herbert 41

*Eternal Egypt* (Robichon-Varille)

Klaus Baer 43

*Rinuccini, Lettere ed orazioni* (Giustiniani)

Revido P. Oliver 44

*The Aeneid of Vergil* (Guinagh)

John Hammond Taylor, S.J. 45

*Caesar: Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars* (Way)

Alfred P. Dorjahn 46

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

*Editor-in-Chief:* NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Indiana University.

*For the Atlantic States:* FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State University.

*For New England:* JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College.

*For the Pacific States:* W. M. GREEN, University of California.

*Book Reviews:* FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., Indiana University.

*The Forum:* MARGARET M. FORBES, University of Minnesota.

*We See by the Papers:* GRAVES THOMPSON, Hampden-Sydney College.

*Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals:* WILLIAM C. GRUMMEL, University of Washington.

#### BUSINESS STAFF

*Managing Editor:* D. HERBERT ABEL, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago.

*Circulation Manager:* JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Bldg., University of Colorado, Boulder.

#### SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general subscription price is \$3.75 (USA), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60c (USA), 65c (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single copy rate. Teachers and other interested individuals may subscribe through one of the regional associations below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may subscribe also to the *CLASSICAL OUTLOOK* and *CLASSICAL WEEKLY*; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of receiving either the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* or *CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (published by CAAS).

#### MEMBERSHIPS

Address the Secretary-Treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Bldg., University of Colorado, Boulder; CANE, CLAUDE W. BARLOW, Clark University, Worcester 10, Mass.; CAAS, F. GORDON STOCKIN, Houghton College, Houghton, N.Y.; CAPS (Northern), MISS CHARLOTTE MILLER, 605 W. 115th St., Seattle 77, Wash. (Central), E. Y. LINDSAY, Grant Union H. S., Del Paso Heights, Calif. (Southern), MRS. JANE M. INFELD, 10474½ Eastbourne Ave., Los Angeles 24.

#### CORRESPONDENCE

Address all general editorial correspondence, MSS, etc. to NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Indiana University, Bloomington; departmental materials to the proper editors listed above; MSS from the Atlantic, New England, and Pacific states to the regional editors above; concerning subscriptions and details of circulation to Sec.-Treas. JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Bldg., University of Colorado, Boulder; on advertising and other business items to Prof. ABEL.

---

THE *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* is published by the *Classical Association of the Middle West and South Inc.*, with the cooperation of the *Classical Association of New England*, the *Classical Association of the Pacific States*, and the *Classical Association of the Atlantic States*. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May). Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Boulder, Colo., with an additional entry at Wilmette, Ill., on September 14, 1953. Entered under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1952.

Printed by Lloyd Hollister Inc.,  
Wilmette, Illinois, U. S. A.

---

#### NOTICE

Members who have not yet sent in 1956-57 membership dues are urged to do so now. This will reduce the work of the Secretary's office and of the Vice-Presidents in sending second bills. Memberships must be paid by December 1, in order to be included on the mailing list for the January issue.

---

#### CANE, 1956-57

Pres. Barbara McCarthy, Wellesley College.

Vice-Pres. Allan S. Hoey, Hotchkiss Sch., Lakeville, Conn.

Sec.-Treas. Claude W. Barlow, Clark University.

Additional members, Exec. Com.: Miss Eileen McCormick, Holyoke, Mass.; Dr. Herrick Macomber, Phillips Exeter Academy; Miss Edith S. Pitt, Portland Me., High School; Prof. C. Arthur Lynch, Brown University.

The 51st Annual Meeting of CANE will be held at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., April 5-6, 1957.

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Volume 52      8 Numbers

1956 - 1957

## Index to Volume 52

WILLIAM D. FAIRCHILD, JR.

*University of Alabama*

### ARTICLES

A. E. Housman, Poet-Scholar, Rockwell, 145

Ancient Education, Downey, 337

Augustus and the *Aeneid*, Avery, 225

Business Values of Classical Training, Murray, 49

Changing Objectives and Procedures in Teaching Latin, 1556-1956, Ganss, 15

Classics in the Twentieth Century, Else, 1

Classics Take the Air, Holsinger, 97

Cleopatra's Pearls, Ullman, 193

Do-It-Yourself: How to Write Latin Verse, Schnur, 353

Easter Poem, Swanson, 289

Historical-Comparative Method, Fowler, 259

Homeric Similes in the Light of Oral Poetry, Notopoulos, 323

How Did Augustus Stop the Roman Revolution? Starr, 107

John Dickinson, the Classical Penman of the Revolution, Gummere, 81

Kipling and the Nature of the Classical, MacKendrick, 67

Life from the Desert Sand, Schuman, 179

Livius Drusus. *t. p.* 122, and his Anti-Gracchan Program, Boren, 27

Logical Analysis and Linguistics, Vail, 274

*Lupus in Fabula*, Abbott, 117

Mediaeval Hymn, *Alma Redemptoris*: A Linguistic Analysis, Musurillo, 171

Palaephatus — Pragmatic Mythographer, Osmun, 131

Problems of Second-Year Latin, Riddering, 61

Psychoanalysis and the Classics, Brown, 241

Rationalism and Irrationalism in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, Hathorn, 211

*Religio* of Lucretius, Howe, 329

Report on the International Congress for Living Latin, Pulgram, 301

Roman Summer, MacKendrick, 149

Samian Stories of Herodotus, Immerwahr, 312

Significant Action in the *Symposium*, Hornsby, 37

Structural Linguistics and Language Teaching, Fries, 265

Structural Linguistics and Latin Teaching, Huzar, 268

Structure of Horace's *Odes*: Some Typical Patterns, Cordray, 113

Vergilian Society's Summer Program at Cumae, Murphy, 209

Vocabulary Short Cuts, Sadler, 159

# WILLIAM D. FAIRCHILD, JR.

## NOTES

- Colored Sawdust (Davis), 361  
Hadrian's Delight (Leon), 360  
Horace and Emily Dickinson (Marcellino), 221  
More on "Action" in Plato's *Symposium* (Hoerber), 220  
Parallels in Juvenal and Housman (Haber), 123  
Seneca and the "New Insight" (Leslie), 125  
Sophocles, Kitto, and Kennan (McDonald), 359  
Structure of Neopos' Lives of Miltiades and Themistocles (Murphy), 125  
Tertullian and Swift's "A Modest Proposal" (Baker), 219  
Verbum Sesquipedale and the Grammarians (Korfmaier), 128

## POEMS

- Catullus 2 (Swanson), 99  
Catullus 3 (Swanson), 137  
Catullus 5 and 7 (Swanson), 66  
Catullus 8 and 43 (Swanson), 76  
Catullus 70 (Swanson), 26  
Catullus 101 (Whitney), 218  
*Elephantia Laudes Praeclari* (Johnson), 253  
Homer (Hart), 308  
Housman Poem in Latin (Schnur), 252  
Lucretius 1. 1-25 (Humphries), 36  
Martial 6. 19 (Meriwether), 88  
Martial 6. 35 (Heath), 116  
*Matronae Imago* (Schnur), 328  
Poem by A. Lang Latinized (Schnur), 222  
Propertius 2. 26 (Heath), 9  
Some Latin Elegiacs (Schnur), 22  
Version of Ovid, *Amores* 3. 2 (Appelbaum), 245  
Versions of R. L. Stevenson's *Requiem* (Schnur), 14

## REVIEWS

- Allen and Italie's *A Concordance to Euripides* (Levin), 92  
Bennett's *The Pylos Tablets: Texts of the Inscriptions Found, 1939-1954* (Householder), 376  
Bennett, Chadwick, and Ventris' *The Knossos Tablets: A revised transliteration* (Householder), 376  
Bonforte's *The Philosophy of Epictetus* (Dane), 140  
Bowie's *Virgil's Georgics: A Modern English Verse Translation* (Copley), 374  
Caley and Richards' *Theophrastus, On Stones: Introduction, Greek text, English translation, and Commentary* (Sofianopoulos), 373  
Colby's *Review Latin Grammar* (Swanson), 191  
Dolan's *Hannibal of Carthage* (Scranton), 191  
Edmonds' *Some Greek Poems of Love and Nature* (Crossett), 138  
Festugière's *Epicurus and his Gods* (De Lacy), 230  
Franzoso's *The Life and Times of Nero* (Collins), 138  
Fridh's *Terminologie et formules dans les Variae de Cassiodore* (Zimmermann), 282  
Garzya's *Alcmane, I Frammenti: Testo Critico, Traduzione, Commentario* (Kirkwood), 89

- Giustiniani's *Rinuccini, Lettere ed orazioni* (Oliver), 44  
Golosovker's *Poety-Liriki Drevnei Ellady I Rima* (Graham), 94  
Guinagh's *The Aeneid of Vergil* (Taylor), 45  
Hill's *The Poems of Sappho* (Kirkwood), 89  
Hunningher's *The Origin of the Theater* (McDonald), 95  
Jongkees and Verdenius' *Platenatlas bij Homer* (Combella), 93  
Knight's *Virgil, The Aeneid: A New Translation* (De Lacy), 371  
Kumaniecki's *Fricius' Opera omnia: Vol. II, Orationes; Vol. III, De ecclesia liber secundus* (Oliver), 286  
Lattimore's *Greek Lyrics* (Kirkwood), 89  
Lever's *The Art of Greek Comedy* (Schlesinger), 281  
Lewis and Reinhold's *Roman Civilization: Selected Readings. Vol. II, The Empire* (Pickel), 366  
Lloyd's *Early Anatolia* (Duke), 230  
Lobel and Page's *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Kirkwood), 89  
Mantiniand's *Dictionary of Latin Literature* (Swanson), 285  
McGarry's *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury* (Swanson), 139  
McKinney's *The Saxon Poet's Life of Charles the Great* (Regenos), 286  
Mikkola's *Isocrates: Seine Anschauungen im Lichte seiner Schriften* (Dorjahn), 93  
Mylonas' *Ancient Mycenae: The Capital City of Agamemnon* (Scranton), 369  
Page's *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Kirkwood), 89  
Pohlentz's *Die Griechische Tragödie, 2 vols., Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage* (Wassermann), 142  
Robichon and Varille's *Eternel Egypt* (Baer), 43  
Smith's *The Failure of the Roman Republic* (Wolverton), 188  
Spaeth's *Index Verborum Ciceronis Poeticorum Fragmentorum* (Harsh), 142  
Stanford's *The Ulysses Theme* (Cutt), 143  
Steffen's *Antologia Liryki Greckiej* (Graham), 237  
Sutherland's *Art in Coinage. The Aesthetics of Money from Greece to the Present Day* (Vermeule), 189  
Thomson's *Classical Influences on English Prose* (Swanson), 370  
Thomson's *Studies in Ancient Greek Society, Vol. II: The First Philosophers* (Herbert), 41  
Ullman and Henry's *Latin for Americans, First Book and Second Book* (Colvin), 232  
Ventris and Chadwick's *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (Householder), 376  
Wallinga's *The Boarding-Bridge of the Romans: its Construction and its Function in the Naval Tactics of the First Punic War* (Mohler), 284  
Way's *Caesar: Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars* (Dorjahn), 46  
Webster's *Art and Literature in Fourth Century Athens* (MacKendrick), 234  
Wheelock's *Latin* (Leslie), 367  
Zuntz's *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Wassermann), 233



## INDEX TO VOLUME 52

### BRIEF NOTICES (Householder)

- Frank's *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, 287  
 Grant's *Tacitus On Imperial Rome (The Annals)*, 287  
 Green's *Aurelii Augustini Contra Academicos. De Beata Vita, necnon De Ordine libri*, 288  
 Haarhoff's *Vergil, Prophet of Peace*, 288  
 Robinson's *Sources for the History of Greek Athletics*, 287  
 Ross' *Aristotelis de Anima*, 288  
 ..... *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta*, 287  
 Sherley-Price's *Bede, A History of the English Church and People*, 287  
 Sidgwick and Morice's *An Introduction to Greek Verse Composition*, 288  
 Turner's *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*, 287  
 Whitfield's *A Classical Handbook for Sixth Forms*, 288  
 Wilson's *The Culture of Ancient Egypt*, 287

### THE FORUM, 10, 54, 100, 163, 202, 247, 298, 345

- ACL Scholarship Plan, 59  
 Alfred University Latin Club 25th Anniversary, 247  
 American Academy in Rome Post, 351  
 Book Notes, Young, 252  
 Boonville Mural, 247  
 Bulletin Board and the Lay Student, White, 11  
 CAMWS College Latin Survey, Sadler, 104  
 Can There Be a New Curriculum in High School Latin? Smida, 102  
 CETT, 251  
 Cheyenne, Wyoming, 300  
 Cicero's Essays in College, Fox, 105  
 Classroom Gadget, Thomas, 206  
 Content of Second-Year Latin, Kovach, 54  
 Foreign Language as a Teaching Field, 205  
 Forum Readers, 352  
 Gile Professorship, 300  
 Going to Greece? 11  
 Golden Anniversary, Connecticut Section, 202  
 Indiana Scholarship, Ewing, 247  
 Inductive Lectures to Graduate Study, 205  
 JCL (New Jersey), LaFountain, 251  
 Junior Classical League: Purposes and Projects, Sister M. Edith, 350  
 Junior High Latin, Harriston, 252  
 Juvenile Classic, Pratt, 348  
 Language Requirement Reinstated at Minnesota, 12  
 Latin and College Aptitude, Henderson, 59  
 Latin and Greek AV Bibliography, 247  
 Latin for Koreans Easier than English, Scarseth, 10  
 Latin! Lively? Moler, 12  
 Latin Major in Industry, Norton, 13  
 Latin Week Awards, Martin, 167  
*Latinus Rumor*, 205  
 Layman Looks at Latin, Sagmaster, 100  
 Leadership through the Liberal Studies, Collins, 349  
 Mary Isabel Sibley Fellowship, 106  
 New Course of Study and Latin in New York City, Walker, 248  
 Occasional Classicist, 300  
 October Meetings, 203  
 Our Challenge: Seventh Grade Latin, Hughes, 298

- Patriotism: Roman and American, Stallman, 346  
 Popularizing Roman History, 12  
 President-Elect Goheen of Princeton, Oates, 352  
 Publicity for Latin, Bock, 58  
 Recruiting in Indiana, 351  
 Reinstatement of Advanced Latin, Malz, 202  
 Reminder, 11, 351  
 Roman Bread, 11  
 Senatorial Free Speech, Fitzgerald, 299  
 Seven Summer Workshops — 1956, Wagener, Pratt, Lind, Sister Mary Donald, Kovach, Johnson, Weightman, 163  
 Should Caesar Be Defeated? Rounds, 103  
 Some Experiments in Teaching Greek in High School, Voss, 299  
 Status of Latin in the Public Schools (CETT), Atkins et al., 57  
 St. Peter's College, 202  
 Summer Sessions: State Univ. of Iowa; Univ. of Michigan, 351  
 They Brought Latin Back to Life, 12  
 Third National JCL Convention, Kyne, 59  
 "To See Ourselves," Marshall, 248; Strasheim (*Dies Irae* — 1956) 203  
 Variety in High School Latin, Whitney, 352  
 VIP's and the Latin Press, 205  
 What Does Latin Need in the High School? Seyfert, 102  
 With the Colleges, 202

WE SEE BY THE PAPERS, Thompson, 23, 79, 129, 175, 223, 279, 334, 363

### NOTICES

- ACL-JCL College Scholarships, 178  
 American Numismatic Society, 170  
 Award of Eta Sigma Phi scholarship, 362  
 Award of Rome Prize Fellowships, 362  
 Battle Fellowship, University of Texas, 167  
 CAAS, Semi-Centennial Anniversary, 297  
 CAMWS, program of annual meeting, 254; officers for 1956-57, 257; financial statement, 1955-56, 258; program of meeting of Southern Section, 77  
 CANE, officers for 1956-57, notice of annual meeting, opp. 1; announcement of annual joint meeting of Eastern Massachusetts section and Classical Club of Greater Boston, 229  
 CAPS, officers for 1956-57, opp. 96  
 Editorial, 358  
 Foreign Language Program and the Classical Languages, 106  
 Herculean Bicentennial, 60  
 Iowa Classical Conference, 280  
 Preview of the Columbus Meeting, 208  
 Sempie Scholarship Grant for Rome, 174  
 Sixth Foreign Language Workshop at Kent State Univ., 229  
 Third International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy, 362

AUTHORS (A: Article; N: Note; P: Poem; R: Review; TF: The Forum)

- Abbott, Kenneth M. (A) 117  
 Appelbaum, Stanley (P) 245

WILLIAM D. FAIRCHILD, JR.

- Atkins, S. D. (TF) 57  
 Avery, William T. (A) 225  
 Baer, Klaus (R) 43  
 Baker, Donald C. (N) 219  
 Bock, C. E. (TF) 57, 58  
 Boren, Henry C. (A) 27  
 Brown, Norman O. (A) 241  
 Collins, John H. (R) 138  
 Collins, Patrick S. (TF) 349  
 Colvin, Belle B. (R) 232  
 Combella, Frederick M. (R) 93  
 Copley, Frank O. (R) 374  
 Cordray, Janice M. (A) 113  
 Crossett, John (R) 138  
 Cutt, Thomas (R) 143  
 Dane, Nathan, II (R) 140  
 Davis, Hugh H. (N) 361  
 De Lacy, Phillip (R) 230, 371; (Notice) 60  
 DeWitt, Norman J. (Notice) 208  
 Donald, Sister Mary (TF) 164  
 Dorjahn, Alfred P. (R) 46, 93  
 Downey, Glanville (A) 337  
 Duke, T. T. (R) 230  
 Edith, Sister M. (TF) 350  
 Else, Gerald F. (A) 1  
 Ewing, Gertrude (TF) 247  
 Fitzgerald, William H. (TF) 299  
 Forbes, Margaret M., see "The Forum"  
 Fowler, Murray (A) 259  
 Fox, Bernice L. (TF) 105  
 Fries, Charles C. (A) 265  
 Ganss, George E. (A) 15  
 Graham, Hugh F. (R) 94, 237  
 Gummere, Richard M. (A) 81  
 Haber, Tom Burns (N) 123  
 Harriston, George E. (TF) 252  
 Harsh, Philip Whaley (R) 142  
 Hart, Charles R. (P) 308  
 Hathorn, Richmond Y. (A) 211  
 Heath, Martha C. (P) 9, 116  
 Heller, J. L. (TF) 57  
 Henderson, Charles, Jr. (TF) 59  
 Herbert, Kevin (R) 41  
 Hoerber, Robert G. (N) 220  
 Holsinger, G. Robert (A) 97  
 Hornsby, Roger (A) 37  
 Hough, John N. (Notice) 258  
 Householder, Fred W., Jr., see "Reviews" and  
 "Brief Notices"; (R) 376  
 Howe, Herbert M. (A) 329  
 Hughes, Catherine (TF) 298  
 Humphries, Rolfe (P) 36  
 Huzar, Eleanor (A) 268  
 Immerwahr, Henry R. (A) 312  
 Johnson, Van L. (P) 253, (TF) 165  
 Kirkwood, G. M. (R) 89  
 Korfmacher, William Charles (N) 128  
 Kovach, Edith M. A. (TF) 54, 165  
 Kyne, Estella (TF) 59  
 LaFountain, M. D. (TF) 251  
 Latimer, John F. (Notice) 297  
 Leon, Ernestine F. (N) 360  
 Leslie, Robert J. (N) 125; (R) 367  
 Levin, Saul (R) 92  
 Lind, L. R. (TF) 164  
 MacKendrick, Paul L. (A) 67, 149; (R) 234;  
 (TF) 57  
 Malz, Gertrude (TF) 202  
 Marcellino, Ralph (N) 221  
 Marshall, Daniel W. (TF) 248  
 Martin, Donnis (TF) 167  
 McDonald, William A. (N) 359; (R) 95  
 Meriwether, Mardi (P) 88  
 Mohler, S. L. (R) 284  
 Moler, Katherine H. (TF) 12  
 Murphy, Charles T. (A) 209  
 Murphy, Paul R. (N) 125  
 Murray, E. B. (A) 49  
 Musurillo, Herbert (A) 171  
 Norton, Kenneth B. (TF) 13  
 Notopoulos, James A. (A) 323  
 Oates, Whitney J. (TF) 352  
 Oliver, Revilo P. (R) 44, 286  
 Osmun, George F. (A) 131  
 Pickel, Frank Givens (R) 366  
 Pratt, Barbara F. (TF) 348  
 Pratt, Norman T., Jr. (TF) 57, 163  
 Pulgram, Ernst (A) 301  
 Regenos, Graydon W. (R) 286  
 Riddering, Donald (A) 61  
 Rockwell, Kiffin Ayres (A) 145  
 Rounds, Dorothy (TF) 103  
 Sadler, J. D. (A) 159; (TF) 104  
 Sagmaster, Joseph (TF) 100  
 Scarseth, Margaret (TF) 10  
 Schlesinger, Alfred C. (R) 281  
 Schnur, Harry C. (A) 353; (P) 14, 22, 222, 252,  
 328  
 Schuman, Verne B. (A) 179  
 Scranton, Robert (R) 191, 369  
 Seyfert, Warren C. (TF) 102  
 Smida, Kenneth (TF) 102  
 Sofianopoulos, A. J. (R) 373  
 Stallman, Alfreda K. (TF) 346  
 Starr, Chester G. (A) 107  
 Strasheim, Lorraine (TF) 203  
 Stuart, M. (TF) 47  
 Swanson, Roy Arthur (A) 289; (P) 26, 66, 75,  
 99, 137; (R) 139, 191, 285, 370  
 Taylor, John Hammond (R) 45  
 Thomas, Grace M. (TF) 206  
 Thompson, Graves H., see "We See by the  
 Papers"  
 Ullman, B. L. (A) 193  
 Vail, James M. (A) 274  
 Vermeule, Cornelius (R) 189  
 Voss, David O. (TF) 299  
 Wagener, A. Pelzer (TF) 163  
 Walker, Israel (TF) 248  
 Wassermann, Felix M. (R) 142, 233  
 Weightman, Esther (TF) 166  
 White, Dorrance S. (TF) 11  
 Whitney, Dorothy (P) 218; (TF) 352  
 Willis, W. H. (TF) 57  
 Wolverton, Robert E. (R) 188  
 Young, Sherman P. (TF) 252  
 Zimmermann, Odo J. (R) 282

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

Volume 52

Number 1

OCTOBER 1956

## The Classics in the Twentieth Century

GERALD F. ELSE

AT ONE POINT in the long process of meditation on this address, I had a momentary idea of calling it "The Classics Amid the Alien Corn."<sup>1</sup> But sobriety and reason prevailed. Coming from an Iowan, the title might have seemed to smack of regional pride, and anyhow a dear friend of mine, Clyde Murley, had once used it, or something very like it, in a talk to Iowa Latin teachers.

Nevertheless that corny title conveyed a part of what I want to say this evening. This will not, I hope, be a lamentation over Jerusalem. It is intended as a cheerful survey of our situation in the twentieth century, emphasizing the hopeful aspects as well as the difficulties. But it will take some note of the strangeness and alienness of this modern world in which we teach the classics of Greece and Rome.

I might begin by quoting some observations on the decline of the Classics, like this:

Modern studies of all sorts were introduced into the curricula of schools and universities and drove out what was left of the teaching of Greek and much even of the instruction in Latin. . . . The utilitarian spirit of the times encouraged others to concentrate on those studies which would help them most quickly to a post and an income. The ideal of a broad, many-coloured and generous culture was out of fashion.

The trouble is that that gloomy statement was not made about the twentieth century, it was made about the late

seventeenth and early eighteenth. I owe the quotation to a witty and highly interesting recent article by Gilbert Bagnani in the *American Journal of Archaeology*.<sup>2</sup> As Bagnani points out, Greek in particular has had its ups and downs, mostly its downs, since the second century A.D. The status of Greek study in the Western world ever since antiquity has been that summed up in the immortal phrase of Sam Johnson: "Greek, sir, is like lace; every man gets as much of it as he can." What is new and perturbing in the twentieth century is not the decline of Greek but the decline, or the threat of a decline, in Latin.

It is customary to attribute this state of affairs to the spread of the vocational spirit. But the passage I just quoted makes it clear that ours is not the first century when the voice of vocationalism was heard in the land. Moreover we forget too easily that throughout most of its history as an educational subject Latin was preëminently vocational. Down to the seventeenth century, if not beyond, most people learned Latin not primarily because of the beauties of Latin literature but because they *had* to learn the language if they wanted to pursue any calling higher than that of ditch-digger or tavern-keeper. Church, law, medicine, science, scholarship, philosophy, instruction, diplomacy, even international business and banking: the passport to them all was

2500  
242  
V-52  
1004-18-1  
may 1957

Latin. Thus it was that Lord Chesterfield could write to his son: "There is no great credit in knowing Latin, for everybody knows it; and it is only a shame not to know it."

Those days have passed. Observation tells us that young Americans do not hang their heads in shame because they don't know Latin; and one chief reason (not the only one) for their shamelessness is that, as Bagnani says, "for the first time in over twenty centuries a working knowledge of Latin is no longer a practical necessity of life."

But it is not only that Latin has lost its direct vocational utility. Consider the vast growth of other fields of study: modern languages and literatures, art, music, modern history, economics, sociology, physics, geology, physiology, etc., etc., etc. The point is not that all these are new as branches of learning or fields of study, but that before the twentieth century most of them were not in the academic curriculum, or else they were taught through the medium of the Classics. Thus, at least in certain periods, French and Italian were considered to be a suitable part of a young English gentleman's equipment, but he did not study them in school or college; history and political science (it might be better to say, political thought) were an integral part of the curriculum, but they were taught out of Thucydides, Plato, Cicero, Livy, Tacitus. In their heyday, the Classics were humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences rolled into one.

*The twentieth century is the first century in Western history in which the Classics are simply one field among many.* And, by the same token, it is the first century in which it no longer suffices to have studied the Classics to be an educated man. (It is hard to say which of these propositions is more frightening to a classicist.) This—from our special point of view—is the first distinguishing mark of our time.

The second is that the twentieth is the *disrespectful* century. One evidence

is the disrespect for the old which is so ill-concealed in our society (hence the newest of the social sciences: "gerontology"); another, the disrespect for law and order. But, sticking to our special last, let us consider only the growing tokens of disrespect for the Classics—that is, for the Classics as *models*, authorities, paragons of thought or behavior or taste, which is what the Classics have been during the last five centuries at least. Here are four examples (they could be multiplied):

1. The attack on traditional grammar—that is, Latin grammar—by our friends the linguists. We heard an exposition of the linguistic point of view this morning;<sup>3</sup> permit me to quote one sentence from a recent book which puts the issue more drastically:<sup>4</sup>

For over a hundred years linguists, psychologists and philosophers have been at work to break this double *tyranny* [italics mine] of traditional logic and Latin grammar and to work out a more realistic view of the relationship between thought and language.

2. The parallel attack on "traditional logic"—that is, Aristotelian logic—by Korzybski and the General Semanticians, who claim that many of our modern dilemmas spring from our bondage to Aristotle.

3. The mounting wave of attack on Plato as a reactionary or an arch-fascist. I will only mention the names of Fite, Crossman, Popper,<sup>5</sup> and point out that, although not everybody in our Western tradition has been a Platonist, such a frontal assault on the greatest name in Western philosophy is inconceivable in the past.

4. The surgery performed by some standard-bearers of modern literature upon the reputations of some classical authors. Thus Ezra Pound, instructing the young poet "How to Read,"<sup>6</sup> reduces Greek literature to Homer and Sappho ("even Aeschylus is rhetorical") and Roman literature to Catullus, Ovid—part of Ovid—and Propertius.

A specialist may read Horace if he is interested in learning the precise demarcation between what can be learned about writing and what cannot. I mean that Horace is the perfect example of a man who acquired all that is acquirable, without having the root. . . . I am chucking out Pindar, and Virgil, without the slightest compunction.

What does all this come to? Partly it is a breakthrough of new modes of thought and feeling, partly it is a revolt against authority as such, like the proverbial rebellion of the adolescent youth against his father. To establish himself, the young man *has* to assert the opposite of what his father believes, or says he believes—even if the beliefs are true and valuable. What we classicists have to remind ourselves is that *Western man is just now, in the twentieth century, getting around to rebelling against the paternal authority of the Classics*. The modern man is enraged by a subject that carries the label "Respect me for my age and wisdom—and because I am your father." Only what *he* experiences, what *he* finds to be true or important, is going to count with him.

But there is more to it than a juvenile reaction, youth sticking out its tongue at age. For the third trait of the twentieth century which I should like to single out here is its *historical consciousness* and *self-consciousness*, the individual's acute awareness of the difference between himself and other men, both present and past. Carl Jung<sup>7</sup> lays this down as *the distinguishing trait of the truly modern man*. And in fact if you look at the leaders of twentieth-century art and literature—and the arts are the best place to catch the accent and spirit of a time—it is unmistakable. Proust, Joyce, Mann, Picasso, Gide, Pound, Eliot, Bartók, Kafka, Sartre, Kazantzakis: the one thing they have in common is their enormous, all-consuming self-consciousness. Whether we like this or not has nothing to do with the case; what we are trying to define

here is facts, not what we think about them.

I have put historical consciousness and self-consciousness together, because they are really two sides of the same coin. Historical consciousness is self-consciousness turned towards the past: it is an awareness of *how different you are from the men of the past*. The twentieth century comes at the end of a long, extremely complex development which we call Western history. The genuinely twentieth-century man—one who lives "at the level of his time," as Ortega says—cannot help being aware of that history and of his difference from it. And this means a new attitude towards the classical past also. The men of the Renaissance saw the men of antiquity through a flat, transparent pane of glass, close at hand, just on the other side of the window: beings in all essential respects like themselves. The Romantics saw Hellas through rose-colored glasses, but still, on the whole, plain glasses: flat, without perspective. The truly modern man can no longer see it that way. His glasses are stereoscopic and focused for distant vision. He sees the Greeks and Romans as people a long way off, irremediably *different* from himself.

Consider this remark by the poet Auden (who was well trained in the Classics):<sup>8</sup>

If there is any reaction to the Greeks which may be called typical of our age as compared with preceding times, it is, I think, a feeling that they were a very odd people indeed; so much so that when we come across something they wrote which seems similar to our own way of thinking, *we immediately suspect that we have misunderstood the passage* [italics mine]. It is the unlikeness of the Greeks to ourselves, the gulf between the kind of assumptions they made, the kind of questions they asked and our own, that strikes us more than anything else.

And he goes on to quote a famous passage from the *Timaeus* of Plato (34 AB), which describes the creation of the world as a "blessed god," then

asks whether anything we know about an African tribe could be more extraordinary. I am not concerned to criticize Auden's statement; what I want to point out is that it could not have been written—at least by an educated man—before the twentieth century.

Now it is easy to say that such self-consciousness is just a pose. But it is not; or, if it is, the pose is an integral part of the modern man. And this is intimately connected with a further trait: that he is consumedly and irritatingly *ironical*. He cannot or will not keep a straight face all the way through the show. He has an awkward tendency to laugh at the wrong places or the wrong people; he even—most disconcerting trick of all to right-thinking people—laughs at himself.

This makes his relationship to the Classics an ambiguous one. Thus Circe turns up in Joyce's *Odyssey* of modern Dublin, but in the questionable shape of Mrs. Bloom. The Sybil furnishes the key-note to Eliot's "Waste Land," but she is the Sybil out of Petronius, not Vergil: the one who hangs on the wall at Cumae in a bottle and is teased by little boys. Or Giraudoux gives us Hector and Paris and Helen once more, in a play which has its serious side; but it is entitled, with a wink at the audience, *La guerre de Troie n'aura pas lieu* (obviously the Broadway producers were afraid that an American audience would not catch the wink, and so renamed the drama *Tiger at the Gates*). The whole idea of the play is ironical, and the tone is a disconcerting mixture of seriousness and jest: a tragi-comedy, but more comedy than tragedy, drawn from the tragic web of the *Iliad*.

Now all these traits of the twentieth-century man—his disrespect for tradition and authority, his historical consciousness and self-consciousness, his pervasive irony—spring from the same root: his freedom. Twentieth-century man—the characteristic man of the twentieth century—is free in a way that educated men were not free in the past.

He has cut loose from the bonds of society, political traditions, religion, old ways of thinking and feeling, to a degree that was unthinkable and impossible in any previous time (at least, in any previous time since antiquity itself). With significant frequency he is an actual exile. The theme of Joyce in Trieste, Eliot in London, Pound in Italy, Picasso in Paris, Mann in California could occupy us for some time, but it would lead us too far afield. The point is simply that the thoroughly modern man is *alone* to a frightening degree, an atomic individual *vis-à-vis* society, historical tradition, and nature. His aloneness is his freedom.

Finally, we must add one more significant trait. The twentieth century is, above all other times in the history of Western man, the century of abstraction. Not only in the intellectual or artistic sphere: we can see it anywhere we look. The staggering size and complexity of our political and economic organizations; the appalling retreat of physical reality inside the atom, into relationships so abstract that they cannot be represented in any conceivable geometrical or visual form, much less in words; the powerful swing towards abstractionism in art; the trend away from song towards purely instrumental music and more and more abstract forms of harmony and musical relation: everywhere we see abstraction as the time-signature of the twentieth century.

Disrespect for authority and tradition; historical consciousness and self-consciousness; insistent irony; freedom to the point of isolation; the pull towards abstraction—here is a set of tendencies that make the position of the Classics problematical as it never was before. The challenge is out of scale with those of the past.

But here let me interrupt myself to take cognizance of an objection. I am fairly sure that at this point many of you are saying inwardly, "All that is very well; it may be true of a handful of French and English intellectuals, or

of d  
it c  
at  
you  
is v  
not  
and  
or  
T  
The  
labe  
the  
an  
as A  
real  
live  
or t  
alon  
Ston  
of th  
tury  
it ye  
unty  
senta  
that  
were  
The  
ways  
But  
found  
are tr  
ranks  
traits  
chara  
be fo  
ticate  
especi  
studen  
Ther  
to doc  
respec  
speak  
person  
over y  
not ex  
not to  
ical co  
that t  
doesn't  
Americ  
idea o  
self an



of cocktail-party folk in New York; but it certainly is not true of most people, at least most Americans, and especially young Americans. What you are saying is way up in the stratosphere. It has nothing to do with the real world I live and teach in, here in Middle-Western or Southern America."

There is something to this objection. The man I have been talking about and labeling "typical," representative of the twentieth century, is by definition an *unusual* man. He is not "like us," as Aristotle would say. Most of us don't really live in the twentieth century, we live in the nineteenth or the eighteenth or the sixteenth, or somewhere back along the line of the centuries to the Stone Age. Only the few at the head of the column are in the twentieth century, the rest of us have not reached it yet. So in one sense those few are untypical, eccentric. They are unrepresentative of their time in the same way that Socrates, Plato, Lucretius, Vergil were unrepresentative of their times. The significant men of an age are always miles ahead of the main army.

But in another sense, and a very profound one, the men ahead of the column are truly representative of those in the ranks. I am prepared to argue that the traits I have talked about are deeply characteristic of our time, that they can be found even in thoroughly unsophisticated and unintellectual people, and especially in young people, your students and mine.

There is time for only a few attempts to document this assertion. About disrespect for authority I prefer not to speak. Suffice it to say that the older person who exercises genuine influence over young people nowadays does it by *not* exercising authority: by seeming not to be authoritative. As for historical consciousness, you may well retort that the average American student doesn't know enough history—even American history—to have any clear idea of the differences between himself and the men of the past. And it is

true, he has no clear idea. But he can *sense* the difference. He instinctively shies away from the study of the past (Classics, ancient and medieval history, any history back of 1900) because he feels instinctively that those worlds are over, have nothing to say to him. Is he not feeling in his bones what Ortega y Gasset puts down in explicit words?<sup>9</sup>

Our heritage consisted in our methods—that is, in the classics. But the European crisis, which is the world crisis, may be diagnosed as a crisis of all classicism. We feel that the traditional ways are useless to solve our problems. People can go on writing books about the classics indefinitely. The easiest thing to do about anything is to write a book about it. The hard thing is to *live* on it. Can we live on our classics today?

Irony: have you noticed that it is a new and growing technique in American advertising, especially advertising aimed at young people? Large corporations cheerfully pay millions of dollars for advertisements that speak jestingly, even disrespectfully, about themselves, and "kidding the sponsor" is a standard gimmick on radio and TV. Among the requirements that students lay down for their teachers, when asked, the one that never fails to appear is "a sense of humor": not meaning necessarily that the prof insists on telling jokes, but that he is a good guy after all and *doesn't take himself too seriously*. Our young people are becomingly serious about many things, but the one thing they will not tolerate is taking oneself too seriously. It does not fit the tone of the times.

As for freedom, that is precisely the bomb that has gone off in our world and is causing our troubles, from Algeria to Cyprus to Indo-China to South Africa to our own South to the farm belt. The twentieth century is that period in the development of man when the idea of freedom has exploded in the minds of *all* men, when *all* men are at last determined to be free. What will be the end of it no one can say: perhaps



Utopia, perhaps some new form of tyranny. However that may be, this is the century of freedom on the march, and our young people would have to seal their minds and hearts hermetically to keep out the awareness of that march. But they have not sealed them; they are aware of it. I am convinced that the profoundest, most serious article of faith of young people in our day, in America and around the world, is personal freedom.

There is a second possible objection to my thesis: that we have been through a radical period, in the first half of this century, but have now changed course and entered on a new phase, a "conservative reaction." I believe that the signs are illusory, that the reaction is not what it seems to be; but in any case we do not have time to discuss it here.

Now what has all this to do with the Classics? As I was saying, it makes our subject more problematical than it has ever been in the past. It is more difficult to teach the Classics today than it has ever been. We cannot expect our students to genuflect when they hear the names of Sophocles or Plato or Vergil. Cicero, in full toga, thundering at Catiline or pleading for the *imperium* of Cn. Pompey, seems to them dreadfully remote, unreal, stuffy—until they somehow catch the idea that, in spite of the difference in scenery, the death-throes of the Roman Republic are full of meanings for us today—or until someone lifts the toga, so to speak, and lets them in on the fact that this solemn orator was also an irrepressible wag, who dearly loved a good joke or a vivid story, and would risk his career for a *bon mot*: in short, until they are made to realize that Cicero was human.

The Classics can no longer be taught automatically. We are past the day of the grand old pedagogical principle that "it doesn't much matter what a boy studies, provided he dislikes it." The Classics have to be helped across the

gap of time and change to our own very different world and into the mind and spirit of the individual student.

But—and this is the "but" that makes all the difference—the Classics also have several immensely potent things to offer, to assist us in helping them across the gap. For one thing, they have *glamor*, and they can hit our twentieth-century students with an electrifying sense of *discovery*.

In spite of pedantry and dull translations and enormous differences of social organization, religion, etc., etc., the great Greek tragedies reach out and touch any student who has half a mind and half an imagination with the effect of an electric shock. Plato, beaten to earth by Popper and the other champions of democracy or the "open society," rises again like Antaeus and has his giant say—even though we may not entirely approve of what he says. Or, judging from my experience this semester in teaching Latin lyric poetry, nothing can prevent young people with any sensitivity from feeling the passion and poetic greatness of Catullus.

Here is an example of what I mean by the "sense of discovery." Mr. Louis J. Halle was a member of the Policy Planning Staff of our State Department under Dean Acheson. In that capacity he found himself looking around for the basis of a *theory* of American foreign policy: something we Americans have never been encumbered with in our 180 years of national existence. He searched, and in his search he stumbled upon —Thucydides! Here is what he says about his discovery:<sup>10</sup>

The most advanced educational theory of the 1920's tended to regard the Greek and Latin classics as obsolete. There was a confused feeling, as I recall it, that they were relics of the Victorian age, from which the younger generation had just been emancipated. . . . The victim of a "progressive" education in an experimental school of the day, I was burdened with something called "social studies"—but not with Greek and Latin. This was surely good, for there is an impish spirit in the universe devoted to

defeating the work of men who think they have the key to a special, patented future. Today I repine inwardly at the thought of "social studies," but premature exposure has not denied me the excitement of discovering Thucydides.

And he goes on to say:

What is remarkable about Thucydides is that he is less obsolete, today, than the chronicles of our most recent past. By one of those paradoxes in which history abounds we are closer to him, his world and his experience, than we are to Queen Victoria. Victoria presided over a world of self-assurance, security, and ease—like the world in which Thucydides had his childhood. As he records the disintegration of his world we see more vividly what is happening to our own.

I resist the temptation to quote more, to go into the reasons why the Greek world of the late fifth century B.C. is more significant and more illuminating to a twentieth-century American searching for a basis for our foreign policy than the world of Queen Victoria or President Cleveland. I will merely remind you that the idea of Arnold Toynbee's *Study of History* was born in 1914, when Toynbee was "reading" Thucydides with Oxford undergraduates. Suddenly it began to come over him that Thucydides had already been over the same ground the Western world was then traversing in the first World War. But if this was so, might it not be true that different societies, in different times and places, went through different but *analogous*, "philosophically contemporary," stages of development?<sup>11</sup>

The difference between Toynbee and Halle is that Toynbee already knew Thucydides, Halle had to discover him for himself. "The excitement of discovering Thucydides"! There is a truly twentieth-century, and truly American, note. Petrarch discovered a new Cicero in the letters; the Renaissance rediscovered Greek literature and philosophy; Keats felt like stout Cortez when he discovered Homer through Chapman. But Petrarch and the Renaissance

were rediscovering things that no one knew at the time; and Keats was not well educated by the standards of his day. It remained for twentieth-century America to *deny* an educated man the chance to know the Classics, and thereby to permit him the excitement of discovering them for himself.

Nobody can say how many people will have Mr. Halle's particular electrifying experience. Perhaps not many. But what I would emphasize is that you do not absolutely have to be denied access to the Classics, in school or college, in order to discover them for yourself. It does not *have* to be an extra-curricular, illicit adventure. I had four years of Latin in high school, in the good old-fashioned way; it was in college, in Classics courses or at least in connection with them, that I discovered Greek literature and then Lucretius; and those discoveries are the real reason why I remained in the field of Classics teaching. I imagine that the experience could be duplicated by many in this room. The crucial discovery *can* be made in isolation from the teaching of the Classics, or it can be fostered by the teaching of the Classics. What is certain is that, however it is brought about, it must be a personal discovery by the student. That is the iron-clad proviso laid down by our century. The Classics have got to speak to the individual spirit of modern man, or they are as dead as Ozymandias or Bāhram, the Great Hunter.

And this is possible; it is even likely. All the disrespectfulness, the self-consciousness, the irony, the rebellious sense of freedom of our time, cannot prevent twentieth-century men and women from finding food in the Classics, to sustain their real hunger. The Classics have four things to offer to modern man which are appropriate to his need, *pertinence* and *passion*, *form* and *freedom*: pertinence to genuine problems, passion to break through the deadly pressure of abstraction on our lives, form to neutralize the fear of

chaos, freedom to nurture the spirit on its own terms.

The way in which these elements work may differ enormously from case to case. It may be a sense of the greatness of Caesar or the tragedy of Cicero's fight for the Republic; it may be the haunting truth of a Greek phrase, or the passion of a poem of Catullus; it may be the paradox of Socrates, living and dead, and more living when he is dead than he was when alive; it may be the spiritual architecture of a Sophoclean play, or the problems of Athenian democracy. Far from being dead to such impressions, the young person of the twentieth century is potentially more alive to them because he can come to them more freely and accept them for their own sake, not simply as a matter of tradition. And the Classics are there, ready to be accepted for their own sake. The status of being museum pieces, hallowed objects of official veneration, is accidental to their nature. In their own right they are living documents of living people, conceived in freedom and ready to be so accepted; for what is freely offered can be freely taken. This is the new way of receiving the message of the past, not as a practical skill or a doorway to positions of "dignity and emolument," but as a part of the life of the spirit.

Permit me to end by citing one example, out of many, of such a free act of receiving. It is from a poem by a man whom many good judges think the best of our younger poets, Robert Lowell; in any case I am proud to say that we have taught Greek poetry together and that he is my friend. The passage is from his poem "The Ghost," based on Propertius.<sup>12</sup> It seems to me that it shows not only how a twentieth-century mind can read and react to the work of a classical author, but how a new kind of Classicism might possibly arise out of such a free meeting of spirits. The poem is based on a well-known elegy of Propertius him-

self (4.7). Its burden is the power of love; not, however, in the romantic sense, but in the grimmer sense that Somerset Maugham illustrated for our time in the novel *Of Human Bondage*. The ghost of Cynthia is speaking to Propertius:

I will not hound you, much as you have earned

It, Sextus: I shall reign in your four books—

I swear this by the Hag who looks  
Into my heart where it was burned:  
Propertius, I kept faith;

If not, may serpents suck my ghost to death  
And spit it with their forked and killing breath

Into the Styx where Agamemnon's wife  
Founders in the green circles of her life.

Beat the sycophant ivy from my urn,  
That twists its binding shoots about my bones

Where apple-sweetened Anio drones  
Through orchards that will never burn  
While honest Herakles,

My patron, watches. Anio, you will please  
Me if you whisper upon sliding knees:  
"Propertius, Cynthia is here:  
She shakes her blossoms when my waters clear."

You cannot turn your back upon a dream,  
For phantoms have their reasons when they come:

We wander midnights: then the numb  
Ghost wades from the Lethean stream;  
Even the foolish dog

Stops its hell-raising mouths and casts its clog:

At cock-crow Charon checks us in his log.  
Others can have you, Sextus; I alone  
Hold: and I grind your manhood bone on bone.

This, it seems to me, is the kind of thing Ortega means when he says:<sup>13</sup>

There is but one way to save a classic: to give up revering him and use him for our own salvation—that is, to lay aside his classicism, to bring him close to us, to make him contemporary, to set his pulse going again with an injection of blood from our own veins, whose ingredients are our passions—and our problems. . . . Let us try to resurrect our classic by immersing him in life once more.

State University of Iowa

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This paper was given, from notes, as the presidential address at the 52nd annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South in Lexington, Kentucky, April 6, 1956. In working up a version for publication I have tried to preserve some of the "oral" quality, and the documentation has been kept to a minimum.

<sup>2</sup> "Winckelmann and the Second Renaissance, 1755-1955," *AJA* 59 (1955) 107-118. The quotation above is from Humphry Trevelyan, *The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism* (London, 1934) pp. 4-5; the one below, from Chesterfield (*Letters to his son*, November, 1739), is on p. 107 of Bagnani's article, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> In a symposium entitled "Linguistics and the Classical Languages," in which the linguistic point of view was particularly represented by Prof. Charles C. Fries of the University of Michigan; the others participating were Murray Fowler, University of Wisconsin, Eleanor Huzar, Southeast Missouri State College, and James M. Va'il, University of Cincinnati. I should not wish any reader to gain from my text the impression that the disrespectfulness spoken of there characterized any of the contributions to the symposium: least of all Professor Fries' singularly courteous—and masterly—presentation.

<sup>4</sup> Manfred Sandmann, *Subject and Predicate* (Edinburgh, 1954) p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Warner Fite, *The Platonic Legend* (New York, 1934); R. H. S. Crossman, *Plato Today* (London, 1937), the fairest and most moderate of these

works; Karl R. Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemies*, vol. 1 (Princeton, 1950). See R. B. Levinson, *In Defense of Plato* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).

<sup>6</sup> In *Polite Essays* (London, 1937) pp. 155-192; the quotations here are from pp. 173-174. It should be said that Pound's reading list is—ostensibly, at least—addressed to the intending poet, i.e., the specialist, rather than the general public.

<sup>7</sup> "The Spiritual Problem of Modern Man," in *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (New York, n.d. [a Harvest Book]; first publ. in English, 1933) esp. pp. 196-199.

<sup>8</sup> *The Portable Greek Reader*, ed. W. H. Auden (New York, 1948) Introd., p. 16.

<sup>9</sup> From the essay "In Search of Goethe from Within," first publ. in English in *Partisan Review* 16 (1949) 1163-88; reprinted in *The Dehumanization of Art and Other Writings on Art and Culture* (New York, 1956, Doubleday Anchor Books) pp. 121-160. The quotation here is from p. 125 (1164). Ortega is speaking of "the classics" in general, not the Greek and Latin classics in particular, but the pertinence of the remark is obvious.

<sup>10</sup> *Civilization and Foreign Policy: An Inquiry for Americans* (New York, 1955) pp. 261-262 (in a long Appendix devoted entirely to Thucydides).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 264.

<sup>12</sup> From "The Ghost" in *Lord Weary's Castle* by Robert Lowell (New York, 1944) p. 52. Reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.

<sup>13</sup> "In Search," p. 160 (1186).

Propertius 2. 26

I saw a shipwreck in a dream and you  
swimming Ionian waters wearily,  
confessing all you spoke that was untrue,  
with weight of ocean burdened heavily  
and tossed about the purple waves like one  
who rode the golden ram across the sea.  
Fear saw the water make your name its own,  
and every sailor's journey mourn your claim  
on ocean. How I prayed to Leda's son  
and the White Goddess, prayed to Neptune's fame!  
and still you die; your fingers barely rise  
to break the surface as you cry my name.  
If Glaucus had the luck to see your eyes  
you had become a daughter of the sea,  
shaken the Nereids with spiteful sighs,  
shining Nesaee, dark Cymothoe.

There came Arion's dolphin to your aid  
when I had all but dived to meet your plea,  
and panic woke and scattered the whole shade.

MARTHA C. HEATH

New Haven, Connecticut

# THE FORUM

MARGARET M. FORBES, EDITOR

IN THIS OCTOBER issue of the JOURNAL, the new FORUM editor wishes to add a personal note of thanks to the Association's tribute given Grace Beede in May. What at first appeared as the most difficult part of a new job, "getting started," has been made immeasurably easier by Miss Beede's arrangements for smooth transition. It is going to be no easy task to achieve the high standard of excellence she maintained in this department, but with the continued support of CAMWS, we promise to do our best.

This is the FORUM as the center of professional business and also as an informal place for news, ideas, and questions.

## LATIN FOR KOREANS EASIER THAN ENGLISH

MARGARET SCARSETH

Latin has a way of turning up in the most unexpected places, e.g., at Chosen Christian University at Seoul, Korea, as a class of pre-theological students taught by Mrs. Carl Strom, wife of the American Chargé d'Affaires, American Embassy. Dr. Carl Strom was a member of the Luther College faculty before entering the foreign service, and is well known to many members of CAMWS. Chosen Christian University is operated by a group of churches as a foreign mission enterprise directed by President George L. Paik.

In a letter dated January 16, Mrs. Strom wrote, "I have a big project that I hope your Latin Club will be interested in. They have never taught Latin at this University. The most recent books and grammars date back to 1886. I am teaching a class of theological students who feel the need of Latin. I have to make up the lessons with the help of these ancient texts. On the fly-leaf of one are scrawled, 'In case of fire, throw in' and 'in case of flood stand on this. It is dry.' One of my students said to me, 'We wish to learn the living Latin.'

"So we want some group at home or a textbook company to supply us with about fifty books. They do not have to be new books or even the latest books. . . . Even if they are torn or unusable because they

are shabby, we can fix them up and use them.

"I have this problem: I would like to teach them to read Caesar because it is a lot of fun and that is what I can do best. But as they are theological students, they ought to read the New Testament. The vocabularies must be quite different for preparing for the two different works. I suppose there are some pre-theology textbooks. Can you recommend me to a company that handles them?

"I must also teach in large doses, catering to the best students because they take the class only once a week. I am hoping to make a contribution to the future, teaching the best students enough so that they can teach others with the help of a good, interesting standard text. . . . Could you . . . rescue me with one book at least? I find myself writing a textbook and making up a lot of Latin much of which I have forgotten."

Since our high school does not keep old textbooks, I wrote Scott, Foresman and Company, asking that a sample copy of the new *College Latin* by DeWitt, Horn, Gummere be sent to Mrs. Strom, and asking about the possibility of a special price in this case. In a genuine spirit of human interest and good will, the company offered a generous discount. Mrs. Strom ordered her texts and sent a partial payment, from her "Latin Fund" collected presumably from Americans stationed or visiting in Korea. I had agreed to campaign for funds "on this side." The balance needed was \$25.00 plus transportation charges. At the CAMWS meeting in Lexington last April, I explained the project and received contributions totaling \$21.00 from the members. (Mr. John Hough, CAMWS Treasurer, has the list of 15 contributors' names.) The Austin High School Latin Club donated \$4.00, and an anonymous member of CAMWS donated the transportation charges. The books arrived in Korea sometime before May 1. The balance due the publisher was paid in full about May 20.

According to Mrs. Strom, "These Koreans are enjoying the study of Latin very much, are proceeding very rapidly, and find Latin much easier to learn than English." Mrs.

Strom will teach the class as long as she is in Korea. After that, as she writes, "I think we'll find somebody." She sent me a picture of the class with their teacher and their organizer and interpreter, Mr. Kim Chang Yul. The one girl in the class is studying French and German as well as Latin and English. (The Latin is offered without credit.) Although the class was organized only a month or two before Christmas, the group sang Latin carols at one of the Embassy Christmas parties. Mrs. Strom writes that she will send us a picture of "the presentation ceremony."

For the time being, no more contributions are being solicited. If any further need arises, there will be a notice in this department of the JOURNAL. To all who helped in the project, a sincere "Thank you" from Mrs. Strom and her Latin students. The project, however small, has certainly done something to promote international good will and to speed the day when East and West shall meet—in brotherhood.

Austin (Minnesota) High School

#### THE BULLETIN BOARD AND THE LAY STUDENT

DORRANCE S. WHITE

For a number of years I have posted, on a huge bulletin-board by my office door, photos and clippings that I thought might interest the lay students as well as those in Classics. That they were interested is attested by an occasional letter of appreciation and, in one instance, by a request for a certain clipping. "Greek Athletics and Festivals," a set with forty durable sheets, has been popular through the years (Hester Harrington Stowe, Set No. 2; photographic reproductions, 12 x 16 inches). Picture cards sent from Italy and Greece by Classics friends have made good "fillers." College students are still patient enough to read, and for these I pinned up pertinent clippings such as the New York Times' reviews of adaptations of Greek plays: the *Thesmophoriazousae*, *Electra*, *Helen of Troy*, *Tiger at the Gates*, etc. Nor were the clippings exclusively classical. There were those pertaining to educational problems of the day, such as "Why Can't Johnny Read?"

Most of us classicists spend a good deal of our extra-classroom energies writing papers needlessly encouraging and exhorting one another about the virtues of Latin study. The *CJ* columns are full of such

material, all irrefutable to you and me. The bulletin-board should help us achieve our ends more innocently. In these days of diminishing Latin-trained parents, we should do something to neutralize, if not change, the thinking of the college student who is exposed to the often hostile educationist's biased views on the value of Latin study in our schools.

State University of Iowa

#### ROMAN BREAD

The Pepperidge Farm (bread) Conveyor for September 1955 contains an interesting article entitled "Downer's Does as Romans Did." At the request of a Downer's Grove Latin class, the Pepperidge group did research on Roman flour, leavening, preparation of dough, and baking, and then donated some "2000-year-old loaves of bread—but they weren't stales. They were 2000 years old in shape, size, texture, leavening, and . . . ingredients," for the Downer's Grove Latin banquet. "After a few experimental batches, they had pulled out of a Pepperidge oven some loaves that looked very much like those in the Pompeian wall painting. . . . It dramatized the fact that the history of bread links us bakers with the history of civilization."

#### REMINDER

A midwestern teacher recently remarked, "We Latin teachers do pretty well in pointing out to our students early in the fall the benefits they may expect to enjoy by taking Latin. How many of us remember to take time in the spring to assess the ones to date? Do our students feel that the product justifies the sales pitch at all stages?"

#### GOING TO GREECE?

How many of you have heard of the reductions and facilities granted foreign students and professors visiting in Greece recently? Our bulletin is the one for 1955; for example, all hotels will grant a 25 per cent reduction of the tariff in force. On railways the reductions are listed up to 50 per cent for students in groups. Sea-services begin at 20 per cent reduction for individuals, increasing according to the number of persons in the group. Special rates are listed for certain types of lodging and for theatres. Camping is free, but local Tourist Police Officials must make the arrangements. For more up-to-date informa-



tion, write: P. Parahelas, Director, National Tourist Organization of Greece, 30 Omicron Street, Athens.

### POPULARIZING ROMAN HISTORY

Miss Gladys Martin, Mississippi State College for Women, has livened up Latin at various state meetings of Latin students during the past two years. Speaking to groups as large as two and three thousand, Miss Martin has been busy giving new insights into Roman history with the aid of her original witty cartoons. She now has developed two series, "Rome through the Republic" and "Rome under the Emperors." Her "Highlights of Roman History," delivered at the Lexington meeting, was a most popular number. Her service to Latin in the public schools through these cartoons and lectures may well be not only a cause of increased Latin enrollment but also an important contribution to vivifying the Romans for American children today.

### LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT REINSTATED AT MINNESOTA

The College of Science, Literature and the Arts at the University of Minnesota voted by a good majority in May to reinstate a language requirement for graduation, effective fall of 1957. The requirement had been dropped in 1946 in a close vote.

### THEY BROUGHT LATIN BACK TO LIFE

The Texas State Teachers Association Magazine *Texas Outlook* ran a feature article on Latin in the Denton Schools (March, 1956). The subtitle reports that the "language which killed all the Romans has been reincarnated as a highly popular subject." The teacher, Mrs. L. A. Hanley, uses many devices to enliven Latin vocabulary, history, and grammar. The principal, A. C. Calhoun, says, "I think this trend toward Latin is an excellent thing. I certainly am encouraged when I see such a large number of students taking such a fundamental and basic subject as Latin."

### LATIN! LIVELY?

*Digest* of a report on the activities of her Latin Club in Mullens, West Virginia, presented at Lexington by:

KATHERINE H. MOLER

Individual projects based on first semes-

ter reading are planned for exhibit during Latin Week. E.g., a Roman temple constructed from a cardboard box and sawed-off broomstick columns with a frieze made of tiny plastic figures saved from Cracker-jack prizes; crinoline and wool-yarn models of different hair styles of Roman women; masks of Comedy and Tragedy; a gilded bust of Julius Caesar modelled over a light bulb; maps (line and relief), Roman books, sandals, a shield and sword, a cart, a ship model; dolls dressed to show Roman fashions; a Trojan Horse; booklets of the lives of outstanding Greeks and Romans, with examples of their work. This impressive exhibit was later moved down town by popular request.

Over the public address system students talked upon the birthday of Rome, the need for study of Latin, and Latin in the professions. The slave auction (buying the services of the slaves for an hour and twenty minutes) was successful financially as well as socially: "One home room had collected enough money to buy a slave to do some cleaning. One little girl bought one to escort her to a movie. Another wanted her locker cleaned, and one boy bought a pretty girl just to have her follow him around. The affair was a riot—in a nice way, of course—and the club has been asked to repeat the auction in assembly before the whole school."

Latin Week festivities were climaxed with a more formal tea given for the Latin Club and sponsor from a nearby school, and for the local principal and teachers. Even more ambitious plans are afoot for the next Latin Week: a Roman wedding in assembly, followed by a slave auction to be attended by the bride and groom in search of slaves for their new home—to finance JCL delegates.

"The rear of the auditorium is to be converted into a forum emphasizing the market place, and there the individual projects will be displayed, plus arrangements for sale—cash—of fruits, vegetables, and Roman bread and cake. Each day over the public address system, some particular product will be advertised. We plan another tea this year, inviting the Latin Club of still another school. In all our efforts we try to get adequate newspaper coverage for the spread of interest in the Classics. Sophocles said, 'Do nothing secretly; for Time sees and hears all things and discloses all,' but we don't want to wait that long. While clubs can stimulate interest in long-gone customs and times, from which much of our own literature and speech is derived, they will spread the gospel of Latin."



## News on Latin

A layman's pro-Latin views always make good news for Classics people. When the layman is Kenneth Norton, Placement Director, College of Arts and Sciences, Ohio State University, this news deserves as extensive reporting as Latin teachers can procure. Why not use the following *abstract* (of a paper presented at Lexington) as a booster to student-parent morale this fall, see that administrators and vocational counselors read it in late winter, and then post it on the bulletin-board in the spring?

### THE LATIN MAJOR IN INDUSTRY

KENNETH B. NORTON

Let me emphasize to you that I never influence any student away from a career in teaching. This applies to students majoring in any area. I fully realize the pressing need for more and more teachers and try to contribute to the supply whenever I can. However, when a student comes to our office looking for placement in business, we do everything we can to help him.

But to return to the Latin major. I am sure that all of us would like more good students majoring in our departments. Well, how can we do it? First, let us stop saying or implying that a classical language major can earn a living only by teaching. Second, let us promote more actively the study of classical languages in secondary schools. Let us remember that many good students would like to elect Latin, or another foreign language, but are deterred from doing so because they feel that it will not contribute to their vocational careers.

So, we should tell them the true story: that industry and business are looking for many different kinds of persons with bachelor's degrees. Of course they are looking for specialists—physicists, economists, mathematicians, and the like. But they are also looking for non-specialists. Business is hiring persons, not majors. Naturally, for the specific technical job a specific major is important. For the non-technical job, to which graduates in the humanities and social sciences will go, the major is immaterial. Mr. Henry DuPont, Vice-President of the DuPont Company, says: "The liberal arts are on the threshold of their most useful period of expression, for our need today is for education in the broadest sense." He goes on to say that, badly as we need technically trained persons, we must also produce leaders capable of rec-

onciling the classic patterns of the liberal arts with the advantages of modern technology.

But where does our Latin major fit into business and why will he be hired in the first place? Obviously, to get a good job he must have a good college record and the proper personality: enthusiasm, vitality, dependability, the ability to get along with others, a reasonable amount of ambition, etc. With these qualities he can be placed in a training program operated by his employer. There he can learn the technical phases of the business, not to the extent that he will be a technical person, but to the extent that he can have technical persons under his supervision. These training programs last from a few months to about three years, and vary from company to company. After the program is completed, there is no limit to future progress but the trainee's capacity. I might add here that most of these formal training courses are operated by large companies. Small ones cannot run a small program and they cannot use a large quantity of trainees year after year.

There are also some positions in business where languages are either helpful or necessary. For instance, the airlines, while they are looking primarily for a fluency in present-day languages, also realize that a classical language background is valuable. This is particularly true in the case of persons who will be representing the airline on foreign flying-fields where fluency is not an immediate requirement, as in the case of sales promotion. Language majors may also find openings in government service. Here they either use the languages they have, or they are taught other less common ones necessary for the job, such as some of the Asiatic languages.

Can Latin majors actually be placed in business? Until a month ago, my record was 100%. Up to that time I had had one Latin major registered in our office, and he was hired by the Ohio Bell Telephone Company several months before graduation. He is now an administrative trainee in their traffic department. In the months since he started to work, I have checked with him and with the company. Both assure me that they are happy with the situation. He has already made good progress.

One of my regrets is that up to now I have had so few Classics majors to place. If I had had more I could give you more examples. However, the principle applies in

all non-technical areas. Among our recent graduates were four majors in Political Science. They entered training programs in four different industries—insurance, retailing, banking, and manufacturing. Any or all of them could just as well have been Latin majors, as far as the employer was concerned. It was their characters, their personalities, their intellectual capacity, as shown in their college performance, that made them attractive.

In the last few weeks, two additional classical language majors have registered with our office. The first of these two men was interviewed by several companies, one of which is a large life insurance firm recruiting for salesmen. This Latin major not only made a remarkably fine impression in preliminary interviews but made the highest score in the sales aptitude test that the company representative had ever seen. He signed the company's contract and we all expect him to have a very happy, satisfactory, and productive career.

The other was registered with us only last week and it is too soon to predict definitely. However, I feel confident that he will soon be placed in an attractive position with good prospects for the future. As employers are finding from their own experience the value of a broad education, they will redouble their efforts to obtain persons with a good liberal arts training.

You and I must spread the good news that a liberal education is desirable vocationally as well as in many other respects. Talking alone will not do it. Words must be backed up by results and every non-technical graduate placed in a good job with a good future is a step in the right direction.

I hope that what I have said to you has proven to be encouraging. I am convinced that what I have said is correct. We Liberal Arts Placement Directors want to place more good classical language majors in good positions in industry. All we need to do this is more good classical language majors.

### Three Versions of R. L. Stevenson's *Requiem*

#### *Elegiac Distichs*

Hic, subter caeli late splendentibus astris,  
 Accipiat cineres terra tegatque meos.  
 Vixi; nec laeto de lumine abire recuso:  
 Haud ingrata mihi nam venit alma quies,  
 Hoc titulo nostrum, comites, ornate sepulcrum:  
 "Gratum quem cupiit nunc tenet ille locum.  
 Contigit optatum iam fessus navita portum,  
 Venator summis iam rediitque iugis."

#### *Alcaic*

Late coruscantes videant meum  
 Stellae sepulcrum. Non sine gaudio  
 Peracta vita est, nec recuso  
 Mortis inire vias libenter.  
 Inscribe his meum lapidem notis:  
 "Desiderato iam cubat hic loco:  
 Venator e silvis revertit,  
 Aequare nauta iacet relicto."

#### *Sapphic*

Siderum meum videat sepulcrum  
 Splendor. Aetatem placidam peregi:  
 Longa quae nunc est mihi dormienda  
 Nox quoque ridet.  
 "Hoc cuba loco tibi tantum amato!  
 Nauta, iam tutum tetigisti portum,  
 Tuque, venator, viridi relicto  
 Colle quiescis."

HARRY C. SCHNUR

New York University

# Changing Objectives and Procedures in Teaching Latin, 1556 - 1956

GEORGE E. GANSS, S.J.

THE SUBSTANCE of this paper can be stated succinctly in one brief paragraph. In 1556 the pupils learning Latin were almost entirely between the ages of six and about fourteen. In the United States in 1956 they are between fourteen and sixteen or a little more. In the sixteenth century the chief objective of the teachers of Latin was to impart the *art* of speaking, reading, and writing Latin with facility, and with elegance when possible, in order that it might be used as an indispensable tool in any higher studies, and then in later life. Through mastering this threefold art the pupils automatically acquired much training of mind and cultural knowledge. By the twentieth century the chief objective of the Latin teachers has to a great extent become the communication of *knowledge about* the language and culture of the Romans rather than the art of using Latin with ease. In both centuries the methods of teaching were geared to the objectives. Four hundred years ago extensive use was made of the direct method, so that Latin words directly evoked ideas rather than vernacular equivalents. Today we chiefly use some variation of the analytic and grammar-translation method, and often we make discipline of mind and cultural knowledge our chief objectives. In our investigations looking towards readjustment, perhaps we ought to direct more attention towards the former aim: communicating the art of speaking, reading, and writing Latin fluently.<sup>1</sup>

How did all these changes gradually occur? To outline the historical evolution is the purpose of this paper. My aim is not to advocate any over-hasty return to objectives or methods which were effective in past centuries, but which might not work today — espe-

cially if we do not have enough teachers trained to use the methods. Rather, my hope is that a bird's-eye view of the gradual change of objectives and procedures within the past four centuries will furnish us background and perspective. These may enable us to contribute more effectively to the numerous present efforts to rethink the position of Latin in university, secondary, and even primary education. There will be less danger of wasting our efforts in a vain attempt to do what history shows to be impossible.

## *Latin from 600 to 1556 A.D.*

The objectives and procedures of 1556 will be better understood if we first briefly review the practices inherited then from the preceding centuries. Sometime between 600 and 800 A.D. Latin gradually ceased to be a vernacular language. By the year 800 it had become in various regions an early dialect of Italian, Roumanian, Provençal, French, or Spanish. But no literature of importance had yet been written in these dialects. In fact, until about 1100 practically nothing of importance was composed in western Europe except in Latin. Most of the books containing the cultural heritage of the past were written in Latin. Therefore Latin long continued to be the language of the liturgy, diplomatic intercourse, philosophy, theology, mathematics, and all learning. If a boy desired an education, he had to get it from Latin textbooks explained in oral Latin.

For many centuries after the death of St. Isidore of Seville in 636 A.D., boys entered the monastic or the cathedral schools at the age of six or seven. To sing in the choir and participate in the liturgical services they memorized the Latin psalms and other

prayers. They learned how to speak Latin by talking it with their teachers. After they acquired a small vocabulary they began the simpler grammar of Donatus called the *Ars Minor* and, shortly later, the maxims entitled *Disticha Catonis*. The teachers gave their explanations in Latin. Much use was made of *colloquia*, dialogues in Latin about everyday matters like eating, drinking, school, and play. When somewhat more advanced in age — often at approximately ten — the pupils entered upon the study of the seven liberal arts: the trivium of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic which was chiefly logic, and the quadrivium of arithmetic, geometry, theory of music, and the theory of astronomy. Among these arts grammar was the most necessary for further studies and later life. Hence it received about half the curricular time.<sup>2</sup>

In the schools, Latin comprised almost the whole curriculum of the boys from the age of five or seven until, sometime between twelve and sixteen, they entered higher studies in law, medicine, or theology. Hence, the boys studied Latin chiefly as a means of communication, that is, as a means of acquiring and expressing important ideas. The educated men of the era could use Latin with ease, with their minds on their thought rather than on a distracting search for words or endings. The spontaneous character of most medieval Latin prose and verse shows that it rolled off the pen as readily as a vernacular.

#### *Latin in the Sixteenth Century*

From 1500 to about 1556, Latin retained in the schools substantially the same position which it had enjoyed in the thirteenth century. But the humanists had added improvements — for example, increased attention to grammatical and dictional accuracy, an esteem of elegance in style, and a love of classical literature as furnishing a pattern of cultural life. Latin was still

an indispensable tool for all the activities of life which required education. Columbus studied his navigation and geography in Latin. The study of Latin was economically as profitable as the learning of engineering, chemistry, or commerce today, because knowledge of Latin opened the way to the choicest positions in the state, or business, or the Church.<sup>3</sup> Hence, parents wanted their children to study Latin, and any children themselves who desired education had motives to study Latin well. The chief objective of teachers and pupils alike continued to be mastery of the threefold art of speaking, reading, and writing Latin with fluency, in order to use it in further studies and then throughout life. By the very fact of mastering that art they concomitantly but accidentally acquired much training of mind and cultural knowledge. Briefly, Latin then served all the functions and purposes which English does for us today in elementary, secondary, and higher education. The study of Latin, like that of the vernacular today, was simultaneously utilitarian and cultural.

This sixteenth-century outlook on the study of Latin shines clearly through the organization of a university envisaged by Saint Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556) in Part IV of his *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, which he promulgated experimentally in 1552. A university then comprised both secondary and higher education. From the age of about five to nine, the boys received their elementary education, ordinarily in a non-Jesuit school. This early schooling taught them how to form the letters of the alphabet, how to write Latin, how to read it, and how to converse in it. Generally there was no formal instruction in or about the vernacular. At about ten, they entered the Jesuit university for four years of secondary education in the faculty of languages. For two years they stressed the grammar of the Latin which they already knew how to speak. For another

er two-year period they stressed rhetoric, poetry, and history. Their objective was to gain complete facility in speaking, reading, and writing Latin, when possible with the elegance which the Renaissance admired. Thus they were ready to use Latin as the indispensable tool for two years, from about fourteen to sixteen, in the faculty of arts or philosophy (comprising logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics, and mathematics), and, after that, from seventeen to twenty-one or higher, for studies in law, medicine, or theology. The basically utilitarian function of Latin in Ignatius' view is seen in this statement:

Moreover, since both the learning of theology and the use of it require, especially in these times, knowledge of humane letters and of the Latin and Greek languages, there must be capable professors of these languages, and that in sufficient numbers.<sup>4</sup>

The added cultural functions are reflected in his frequent insistence that the students should polish their style. The teachers "should make those who are studying the humanities get practice by ordinarily speaking Latin, by composing, and by delivering well what they have composed."<sup>5</sup>

#### *Procedures of the Sixteenth Century*

The day-to-day classroom procedures in teaching are adjusted to the objectives of the teachers. One of our best sources to study in detail the methods of Latin teaching in the sixteenth century, and the textbooks used, is found in the *Docendi Ratio in Ludo Burdigalensi*, the *Program of Studies in the College of Guyenne*, the province of France in which Bordeaux is situated. Written by Élie Vinet in 1583, this document is the record of the practice of half a century in one of the best classical schools of France. Time does not permit a summary of the whole document; but high lights will suffice for our present purposes.

The hours of class were from 8 to 10, 12 to 1, and 3 to 5, through a school

year of eleven months interrupted by holidays on ecclesiastical feast days. The purpose of the school was clearly expressed as "the learning of the Latin tongue." *Latino sermoni cognoscendo haec schola destinata est*. The boys, except the very youngest, were required to speak only Latin all the time they were in school.<sup>6</sup>

They entered it at the age of six or seven, and were known as "Alphabetarii." Each had two textbooks, the *Alphabetum* which contained the alphabet in small and capital letters, the *Pater*, the *Ave*, and the seven penitential psalms, and the *Libellus Puerulorum* which contained the inflections of the regular nouns and verbs. The pupils sat on five rows of benches without backs. When the lesson treated, for example, the psalm *Miserere mei, Deus*,

The teacher pronounces the first word, *Miserere*, and the children repeat it, *Miserere*. Then the teacher names the letters, and groups the syllables of the same word, *M, i, Mi*. He says: *s, e, se, Mise*; the pupils repeat, *s, e, se, Mise*. He: *r, e, re, Misere*; the pupils repeat, *r, e, re, Misere*. Then the teacher finally says: *r, e, re, Miserere*, and the pupils repeat, *r, e, re, Miserere*.<sup>7</sup>

Then the teacher turned his attention to the second row of benches, and used the same process with the second word, *mei*. He continued until all the pupils present could recite the whole verse: *miserere mei, Deus, secundum magnam misericordiam tuam*. In time the boys were taught in this class to copy the letters of the alphabet, to decline the nouns, and to conjugate the verbs. They were promoted when they could read the *Pater*, *Ave*, and seven penitential psalms, write legibly, decline, and conjugate. In all the classes, through a flexible system of promotions, bright boys were advanced more rapidly than a class a year.

In the ninth class, aged eight or seven, they studied reading and writing in both Latin and French, declensions and conjugations, and the Dis-



*ticha de moribus* of the unknown Cato. The textbook printed these simple maxims with French translations at the foot of the page.<sup>8</sup> A sample:

Si Deus est animus, nobis ut carmina dicunt.

Hic tibi praecipue sit pura mente colendus.

In the eighth class, they studied *Letters* of Cicero and the *Colloquia* of Mathurin Cordier, a manual of Latin conversation with vernacular translations. The use of this manual here proves that Latin conversation was now being systematically pursued in this class of eight-year-olds. Here is a sample from Colloquium II.<sup>9</sup>

Stephanio and Praeceptor

S. Salve praeceptor!

P. Salvus sis, mi Stephanio.

Unde venis tam multo mane?

S. E cubiculo nostro.

P. Quando surrexisti?

S. Bon iour mon maistre.

Le Maistre. Et à vous, mon mignon.

Stephanio. D'ou venez vous si matin?

S. De nostre chambre.

Le Maistre. Quand vous estes vous levé?

In the seventh class, aged about nine, they studied *Letters* of Cicero, and began the Latin grammar of Des-pauterius, written in Latin hexameters. The sixth class continued these *Letters*, with much explanation of construction. In the fifth, one play of Terence, one book of Ovid's *Epistles*, and rules of prosody were added. The fourth-class students, aged about twelve, studied the *Tristia* of Ovid, an oration of Cicero, and a manual of rhetoric. There were frequent exercises in grammar and composition. Here, too, Greek was introduced into the curriculum. In the third class, they took an oration and *Letters* of Cicero and the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, and also learned to write Latin verse. The second class worked on selections from Cicero's orations, Vergil, Ovid, Lucan, Roman history, and Latin declamation. Here arithmetic was begun.

The first class, aged about fifteen (or often thirteen when early promo-

tions had been earned) studied the art of oratory from Cicero or Quintilian, speeches of Cicero as illustrations of the precepts, history from Livy, Seneca, Justin, and Mela, and poetry from Vergil, Lucan, Persius, Juvenal, Horace, and Ovid. There were also compositions in prose and verse, declamations, readings in Demosthenes and Homer, and a continuation of mathematics. At the age of sixteen, or often fourteen, the pupil entered the faculty of philosophy to study Aristotelian logic, the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, Greek, and mathematics. In the next year he took Aristotle's *Physics* and Greek mathematics.<sup>10</sup>

### *The Liberal Education of the Renaissance*

That suffices for our consideration of the objectives, matter, and methods of Latin teaching in approximately 1556. But whither was all this effort leading?

The education so far described is what we today term secondary. Its function was to prepare the pupils for something higher. In the earlier Renaissance until 1500 or even about 1560 men turned their attention more and more towards living a full, rich life on earth. They pursued the ideal of *humanitas*, by which they meant intellectual power, aesthetic sensitivity, literary elegance and taste, polished manners, and elegant deportment for that being whom they admired, man considered as a citizen. As yet the vernacular languages contained few or no educational treatises or patterns for such living. So the humanists turned to what was available in the ancient writers. One important result was a revival of the ancient ideal of liberal education which had been formulated especially by Plato, modified by Aristotle, and adapted to the Romans by Cicero and Quintilian. Treating the idealized education of the philosopher-king in the *Republic*, Plato had composed a plan for the well-rounded training of the whole man to the ex-

cellence or virtue of all his powers, that he might aid society by governing it well. Developing this concept, the educators of the earlier Renaissance conceived the aim of education to be that of producing the perfect man equipped to participate well in the social and political activities of his day. The ideals took slightly different form in the "complete citizen" and Christian gentleman of Vittorino da Feltre (1378-1446), the perfected Christian gentleman of Vergerius (1349-1420), the courtier of Castiglione (1478-1529), the Christian scholar of Erasmus (1466-1536), the gentleman-scholar of Thomas Elyot (ca. 1490-1546), and the Christian humanist and citizen of Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556).<sup>11</sup>

However, through a slow historical evolution, the broad and inspiring liberal education of the earlier Renaissance was transformed into the more narrow humanistic education of the later Renaissance.<sup>12</sup> In 1444 Lorenzo Valla published his *Elegantiae Latini Sermonis*. Intending to improve the quality of the Latin written and spoken by students, he attacked the Latin of the middle ages as barbarous, and extolled Cicero as the great ideal. Thus he initiated a movement which was beneficial in many respects. But he little suspected that within a century or so it would grow into the elaborate excesses of Ciceronianism. This cult of Cicero gradually turned the study of Latin into a study of form rather than of content, of linguistic or stylistic details rather than of literature as a source of significant ideas and of a pattern of living. Especially powerful after 1568 (the date of Nizzoli's *The-saurus Ciceronianus*), it reduced the broad liberal education of the earlier Renaissance into a preoccupation with forms and words rather than with things and significant ideas. It limited the vocabulary of Latin to that of Cicero, and made fashionable long, involved sentences which did not roll spontaneously off the pen, but smelled

of the phrase books and midnight oil. Thus it killed Latin as a living language which men could use with ease, unencumbered by fear of snobbish criticism for some slight flaw in Ciceronian elegance.

### *Rise of the Vernaculars*

Unfortunately for Latin as a language, these developments occurred precisely when the vernacular languages, previously only groups of dialects, were being unified and used for serious writing. Soon they were employed in literary works which did present patterns of living. Men now found that they could acquire and express their ideas more easily, and shade and qualify them more accurately, in their vernaculars than in Latin, especially in that of the ponderous Ciceronian type. Latin gradually lost its utility for learning and extra-school life, diplomacy, the teaching and writing of law, mathematics, medicine, science, and other subjects. Consequently it also lost importance and space in the curriculum of the liberal or general education of youth. New subjects taught in the vernacular supplanted Latin more and more. These new subjects were as useful for living and learning in their day, and even for earning a living, as Latin had been in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Especially from about 1700 onwards, the vernaculars replaced Latin as the medium of instruction in the universities. In 1729 Sir Francis Hutcheson gave the first known lecture in English in a Scottish university. Similar procedures were used in the newly founded German universities such as Halle (1694), Göttingen (1737), and Erlangen (1743).<sup>13</sup>

Almost like the scholastic philosophers of the period of decadence in the fifteenth century, the teachers of Latin, rightly convinced of its worth and trying to defend its place in the curriculum, pointed to it as an effective means of imparting mental train-



ing. Their effort issued in a disciplinary theory of education which held that the teacher's most important objective is not the content learned but the sharpening of the mind in the process of learning. The theory found its perhaps clearest and most influential expression through John Locke (1632-1704) and Christian Wolff (1679-1754). The teachers also rightly pointed out that Latin is the vehicle of rich cultural knowledge. All these arguments contain much truth, and it would be folly to discard them. But neither should they be used for more than their worth; and we must face the fact of history that they have only retarded, not stopped, the declining place of Latin as a language in the curriculum. A sound educational philosophy must entail much training of mind. But throughout history the most successful education has aimed primarily to impart knowledge and skills which are useful for living in the contemporary society, and even simultaneously for earning a living in it; and the education has imparted the training of the mind by means of the student's mastering that useful knowledge. The disciplinary theory of education is defective because it overevaluates something which nevertheless ought to be present. It sets up training of mind as the end of learning rather than as a concomitant, and discards the true end, the knowledge of worthy subject-matter and mastery of worthy skills.<sup>14</sup>

After 1650, while Latin was losing its practical utility and economic value, and while the teachers were being constrained more and more to appeal to mental discipline and cultural knowledge as the motives for studying it, they gradually dropped the root objective which in 1556 had entailed all the rest: communicating the art of speaking, reading, and writing Latin with fluency, that it might be used as a tool in higher studies and then in later life. By the last half of the nineteenth century, the teachers often

no longer led their pupils through many complete works of literature in search of a pattern of living, but sought mental discipline by traversing several hundred "lines" of Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, or Livy. The direct method of teaching Latin which if used long enough brought extensive repetition of forms and familiarity and ease in the language, yielded completely to some form of the method of grammar, translation, and parsing. In former centuries, before taking up difficult authors like Caesar or Cicero the students had for years first used easy Latin and the *colloquia* with interlinear or parallel vernacular translations, which if used aright can be an effective aid in learning a language. But now the pupils were given the difficult authors right after the elements, and the use of translations became ethically suspect. The students had to decipher and translate rather than grasp the ideas directly from the Latin. The process became distasteful drudgery and drew criticism from educators and parents while enrollments continued to fall.

This state of affairs is reflected in the Report of the Classical Investigation of 1923. (That investigation is only one manifestation of the truly energetic zeal displayed by American teachers of Classics to re-examine their objectives and procedures, and to adapt them to modern times.) Ability to speak Latin was not listed as an objective by the teachers, and use of Latin after its study in school or college was ranked lowest among the nineteen objectives stated. The remaining objectives were grouped under the headings of instrumental objectives (like better understanding of Latin quotations), disciplinary objectives, and objectives of cultural knowledge.<sup>15</sup>

Shortly after 1920 came the attacks of the materialistic psychologists which brought discipline of mind into disfavor with many teachers and counselors as a serious motive for studying

Lat  
this  
mu  
fun  
roll  
Hap  
now  
sear  
spee  
of s  
min  
Th  
offer  
cult  
thro  
in tr  
this  
guag  
effec  
rolli  
tinu

Incr  
Cultu

But  
pictu  
doxic  
the I  
panie  
by a  
terest  
Gree  
lation  
Great  
Engli  
in cla  
and  
have  
progr  
many

The  
cists  
selves  
revert  
cation  
object  
virtuo  
take a  
intellec  
cal pro  
ern w  
wrestle

Latin. For a while, in many circles this argument, perfectly valid if too much is not claimed for it, ceased to function, and the percentage of enrollments in Latin continued to fall. Happily, the pendulum has swung back now, and abundant psychological research has demonstrated that with respect to ideals of mastery and methods of study there is abundant training of mind and transfer of training.

The further discovery was made that often the students could obtain the cultural knowledge more easily through cultural history and classics in translation. Hence, for a time even this motive of studying the Latin language seemed to be growing more ineffective, and the percentage of enrollments in the Latin language continued its fall.

#### *Increased Interest in Classical Culture*

But there is a brighter side of the picture, to which we now turn.<sup>16</sup> Paradoxically, the decline in the study of the Latin language has been accompanied, on the college and adult level, by an unprecedented increase of interest in the classical culture of Greece and Rome. Classics in translation form a large part of lists of Great Books. College courses using English translations of Greek and Latin classics are growing in popularity, and classical literature and culture have important places in the strong programs of general education in many of our leading universities.

The upshot is that the alert classicists of today who are adapting themselves to modern circumstances have reverted to the ideal of liberal education of the early Renaissance. Their objective is to produce knowing and virtuous American citizens eager to take a beneficial part in solving the intellectual, artistic, social, and political problems of America and the modern world. The Greeks and Romans wrestled with similar problems, and

we can learn much from the solutions they found. Like the educators of the early Renaissance, classicists today think that the important ideas enshrined in the works of ancient literature taken as wholes, and in ancient culture, are an important means of achieving this educational goal. But the medium of obtaining those ideas has necessarily changed. We would impart complete mastery of the original languages if we could. But in the curricular time available (often only six to fifteen semester hours) it is impossible to communicate skill in the Latin language and an adequate knowledge of classical literature and culture as a whole. In this march of history, that is where we are today.

However, the need to know the Latin language too will remain and, we have reason to believe, even grow. Classical literature in translation and classical culture can be adequately interpreted only by those who know something of the languages. Also, in the Christian Church much if not most of our doctrine and our culture has been deposited in Latin. Hence capable scholars of Latin will ever be necessary to interpret the deposit aright and to keep it abreast of ever developing science. So there is an important future for Latin language, literature, and culture.

The current investigations of the American Philological Association, the interest in descriptive and structural linguistics, and other experiments all make evident that classicists today are earnestly reappraising the entire position of Latin in the curriculum, and trying to readjust their objectives and procedures to modern circumstances. One important and pressing task before us is to devise some more natural method, some more efficient means of teaching the Latin language. The sixteenth-century methods of teaching Latin, with modern improvements such as tape recordings, are successfully being used to impart the art of speak-

ing, reading, and writing a modern language, and that by means of twelve semester hours taken within one year. Will it perhaps be wise to apply these or similar methods once again to the teaching of Latin, at least with our more mature and better motivated students who desire to use Latin in future studies?

Latin literature, like that of Greece, is still recognized as having much to contribute to a liberal education. This will make it necessary for many to master at least the Latin language. My hope is that, aided somewhat by this historical perspective, we can now with confident hearts work anew at our experiments and discussions to make the Latin language again something highly functional as well as cultural in the modern curriculum.

*Marquette University*

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This paper was presented to the Classical Association of the Middle West and South at its Lexington meeting, April, 1956. Much of the material is treated more extensively and with fuller documentation in George E. Ganss, S.J., *Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University* (Milwaukee, 1954) esp. in App. I, pp. 208-248, "A Historical Sketch of the Teaching of Latin."

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 121-124, 208-210.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 164-166, 210-215.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 321.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 323, 330.

<sup>6</sup> Louis Massébieau, *Schola Aquitanica, Programme d'études du collège de Guyenne au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1886) p. 40.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> A facsimile is printed in Ganss, p. 88.

<sup>9</sup> For a description and facsimile reproductions of the colloquia, see Ganss, pp. 91-100.

<sup>10</sup> For the material studied in each year at Guyenne, see Massébieau, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-26.

<sup>11</sup> Ganss, pp. 139-146.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 146-153, 175.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 215-219.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 75-79, 219-223.

<sup>15</sup> *The Classical Investigation*, Part I (Princeton, 1924) pp. 33-40.

<sup>16</sup> Ganss, pp. 230-247.

## Some Latin Elegiacs

*Matthew Prior*

### A Reasonable Affliction

On his deathbed poor Lubin lies;  
His wife is in despair:  
With frequent sighs and mutual cries  
They both express their care.

"A different cause," says Parson Sly,  
"The same effect may give:  
Poor Lubin fears that he may die;  
His wife, that he may live."

*C. Arrius Nurus*

Livius extremas dum ducit morbidus horas,  
uxor desperans solvitur in lacrimas.  
ipse gemit, resonant et femineo ululatu  
tectis, et ambobus pectora plena metu.  
"Dissimilis similem cit causa utrique timorem,"  
callidus in cena tum parasitus ait.  
"Mors ne se rapiat, formidat territus ille,  
mortem vir ne non oppetat, illa timet."

*New York University*

HARRY C. SCHNUR

# We See by the Papers

GRAVES H. THOMPSON, EDITOR

## HOW LONG AGO WAS CAESAR ASSASSINATED?

*Julius Caesar, in his turn, seems to have fallen afoul of the calculations, or miscalculations, that attend the passage from the B.C.'s to the A.D.'s. Time, in its issue of March 26, 1956, ran the following lively account:*

As a warning to the overeager, Classicist Jotham Johnson of New York University posted a special memo in the classics department last week. "The sordid rumor has been promulgated," he wrote, "that March 15, 1956, is the 2,000th anniversary of those Ides of March on which C. J. Caesar was assassinated. This results from an inaccurate or hasty computation, for March 15, 44 B.C. to March 15, 1 B.C. equals only 43 years; March 15, 1 B.C. to March 15, 1 A.D. equals one year. (There was no zero year.) March 15, 1 A.D. to March 15, 1956 makes a total, then, of only 1,999 years."

Though it was not his intention, Johnson's calculations struck directly at N.Y.U.'s great rival, Columbia University. There, library officials had already set up a lively exhibition commemorating the 2,000th year of Julius Caesar's death. Now, it seemed, Columbia was commemorating a year too soon. University classicists promptly split on what to do. Scottish Gilbert Highet ("I'm a classicist, not a mathematician") was for calling the whole thing off, but bearded classicist Moses Hadas favored the exhibition. Meanwhile the university news office, citing the Columbia Encyclopedia, informed reporters that "because of poor time calculation in earlier times," even the birth of Christ "must be dated a little earlier, probably 4 B.C." Therefore, the news office implied, one year in Caesar's case hardly seemed significant. Nevertheless Columbia changed the [sign] over its exhibition to read:

2,000th\*

ANNIVERSARY

\*Or, if you wish, 1,999th.

*Meanwhile, in Rome things had gone even worse (or perhaps the Italians were waiting until next year). An A.P. dispatch (Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 16, 1956) reported:*

Republican Italy dealt Julius Caesar the "most unkindest" cut of all Thursday. It virtually ignored him on the 2,000th (!) anniversary of his death. One Rome newspaper, like Mark Antony, came forward to plead the once mighty dictator's cause. But only the Fascists put a green wreath and flowers on his bronze statue near the Roman Forum. Rome's City Hall brushed him off as "a pagan."

## CHEMISTRY FOR DATING ANCIENT COINS

*According to an A.P. dispatch in the January 16th issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch:*

Chemistry can date ancient Greek coins even when wear or corrosion makes the dates on them illegible, say Dr. Earle R. Caley and Wallace H. Deeble of Ohio State University.

Dr. Caley has charted systematic changes in lead and tin content of Greek bronze coins. Using his figures, a chemist can date a coin with a possible error of 25 years each way, he says. He began assembling his data when he operated a chemical laboratory on the site of the Athens Agora during excavations in the late '30's.

## LUCRETIVS AND RAIN

*An article in Newsweek (March 5) on the sea-salt hypothesis of rain formation brought forth the following letter from Duncan C. Blanchard in the March 19th issue (clipping sent in by Emory A. Samson, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida):*

Tut, tut, gentlemen, you'll find that ideas on the sea-salt hypothesis of rain formation go back far earlier than the time of "John Aitken, an impoverished Scottish marine engineer," for 2,000 years ago a certain impoverished Roman poet named Lucretius said: "We must reckon also with the fact that nature causes a constant stream of particles to rise up from the whole ocean, as shown when clothes hung up on the shore receive an accession of moisture. This suggests that the clouds may also be swollen, in no small measure, by an exhalation from the ocean's briny surge; for its moisture is of a kindred quality."

## A CLASSICAL ANTHROPOLOGIST?

*A contributor sends in the following news article from the Los Angeles Mirror-News (October 27, 1955):*

One of the world's leading anthropologists today challenged Darwin's long-accepted theory of human evolution. . . . Dr. Loren C. Eiseley, of the University of Pennsylvania, rejected Darwin's main thesis because, he said, it fails to explain the chief physical characteristic that sets man apart from all other creatures—his great brain. . . .

[However, a UCLA anthropologist took the Eiseley article with a large grain of academic salt:] "Dr. Eiseley has given the whole thing a definite fictional slant. I understand he was a classical scholar before he came into anthropology, so maybe he's allowing sentiment to run away with sense."

*A search of Who's Who fails to reveal any classical strain, or stain, in Dr. Eiseley's background, but the idea is a pleasing one, just the same.*

## CONVERSATIONAL LATIN

John O'Hara, in his column "Appointment with O'Hara" (Collier's, October 28, 1955), relates an unusual conversation with Burgess Meredith the actor:

Some things strike me funny. The other day I took Burgess Meredith to lunch at a beach club. . . . Do you know how the dialogue went . . . ? No, you don't.

MEREDITH: *Fero, ferre, tuli, latus.*

O'HARA: *Frango, frangere, fregi, fractus.*

MEREDITH: How about a deponent one?

O'HARA: Wait a minute: *sum, esse, fui, futurus.* You do a deponent one.

MEREDITH: You can't think of one.

Well, I could, but not right away because I was wondering how many of our mutual friends would believe that Meredith and I could ever spend two minutes on the conjugations of Latin verbs.

## PUBLIC INTEREST IN ROMAN BRITAIN

*A clipping from the New York Times of March 4 brings the following news from London:*

A wave of interest in Caesar's legions and the civilization they brought to Britain 2,000 years ago has turned a British Broadcasting

Corporation booklet on Roman Britain into a best seller.

A B.B.C. spokesman said today that the thirty-two-page pamphlet had been bought by more than 44,000 persons and was still selling fast. There have been four reprints already. Last year, a similar publication on pre-Roman Britain sold 29,000 copies. Public interest in the subject has been stimulated by a series of broadcasts on Roman Britain.

## PRAISE FOR THE PANTHEON

*From a Profile of Miss Jean Rosenthal, New York theatrical lighting expert, in the February 4 New Yorker:*

Her favorite building in Europe is the Roman Pantheon. The ray of sunlight that enters through the aperture in the middle of its dome, she maintains, is one of the most striking uses of the overhead spot she has ever seen.

## THEOCRITUS IN MUSIC

*From Time of January 30:*

When a composition by Roger Sessions is played, it is a major event. . . . The Louisville Orchestra, under Robert Whitney, [recently] premiered [his new] cantata—really a solo aria the size of a full-grown concerto. Titled *Idyll of Theocritus*, it was even more imposing than previous jam Sessions.

The text is the second *Idyll*, one of literature's great love poems, by 3rd century B.C. Greek Poet Theocritus. The piece divides into four moods, as the forsaken girl Simaitha gathers magic spells, then tells the moon goddess how she met her lover, goes on to tell how she became his mistress, and finally explains his desertion and her determination to win him back. . . .

Louisville critics . . . were deeply impressed. "History may record," said the Louisville Times, "that a masterpiece was unveiled."

*It is interesting to note that Vergil imitated this second Idyll of Theocritus in his eighth Eclogue: and Charles Martin Loeffler drew the inspiration for one of his great compositions, A Pagan Poem, from Vergil's poem.*

## ICARUS FLIES AGAIN

*Morris Rosenblum of Brooklyn sends in a clipping from the November 23rd New York*

Herald Tribune describing a small automobile which may be converted into an airplane in five minutes:

Icarus, according to Greek mythology, strapped on wings of wax to escape imprisonment on the island of Crete but flew too near the sun and, his wings melting, plunged into the sea.

His modern counterpart, a young man named Frazer Dougherty, hitched wings to a small automobile at Teterboro Airport this afternoon and flew safely to Danbury, Conn.

In fact, Mr. Dougherty paid what was perhaps unconscious homage to his Greek predecessor. The strange land-air vehicle which he drove and flew today is called an "air-*phibian*" and that word was built on a Greek root. . . .

There are two things about this piece which disturb us. One is the word "air-*phibian*," as irrational a coinage as Winston Churchill's "triph**ibian**," on which it was probably modeled. The other is the reference to the ill-fated Icarus, rather than to his father Daedalus, who was more successful in his aviation. Absit omen.

#### STATUS OF THE ANCIENT CLASSICS IN RUSSIA

"In Defense of a Forgotten Field" is the title of an article by N. Deretani, head of the Classical Philology Department at Moscow State University, and I. Nakhov, candidate of philology, in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, November 10, 1955, p. 2. A translation appeared in the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, February 1, 1956, pp. 3-4. Excerpts from this translation printed below are used with the permission of that publication.

Robert E. Lane of Phillips Academy, to whom we are indebted for these excerpts, commented as follows: "Because articles such as this are often printed in Soviet periodicals as a prelude to change in official policy, and are followed by discussion pro and con, I have examined the issues of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* from November 10, 1955 to February 28, 1956, for further references to this subject, but I have found none. It seems probable, therefore, that this is a lone protest, and that no new policy is to be expected."

In the history of culture there has been no other period which had such enduring and beneficial influence on subsequent generations [as classical antiquity had]. . . .

Without a knowledge of the ancient classics, one cannot fully understand many phenomena of Russian and foreign culture. . . .

Ancient times were, in a way, neglected because of the pressing tasks of our days. A few enthusiasts continued working on questions of classical culture, enduring the attacks of Proletkult nihilists, disciples of the Pokrovsky school of history and adherents of the "new teaching on language," which denied the importance of classical languages for linguistics. A certain prejudice against classical education dates back to the days of the scholastic teaching of ancient languages in the Tsarist gymnasias and the role played by Belikov-type reactionaries in that instruction. Nowadays no one dares openly to deny the importance of the classical heritage, but occasionally one hears: "Your field is no longer vital. It has had its day. It is obsolete and simply unnecessary." Strangely enough, this reasoning has been adopted openly or tacitly by some officials of the Ministry of Higher Education and Ministry of Education. With their blessing, classical studies began to fall off in our institutions of higher learning, and, as a result, the spread of classical erudition in our country declined.

At present only the universities in Moscow, Leningrad, and Lvov have classical philology departments, and their enrollment is limited to 10 to 15 students. Graduate enrollment is even smaller. The teaching of ancient languages and literature in teachers' institutes has been reduced to a pitiful minimum, and in the universities it is being squeezed out slowly but surely by the decisions and policies of local administrators. . . .

How can one discern the artist's intent without a knowledge of the ancient myth, legend, or tradition which provided the subjects for so many canvases? The exhibitors [of masterpieces of the Dresden Gallery] had to change the inscription under Van Dyke's "Drunkard Silen" [i.e. Silenus] to "Landscape with Drunkard Silen" because there were people who looked at it and repeated with genuine admiration: "Yes, the drunkard is silen!" (silen in Russian means strong).

Quite recently there was a large printing of Edgar Allan Poe's "The Gold Bug." The annotator translated the Latin phrase "scarabaeus caput hominis" as "the bug is man's death," obviously mistaking the Latin *caput* (head) for "kaput"! The correct translation would be: "The scarab is the human head." . . .

Very few Greek and Roman classics



have appeared on the book market in recent decades. The items published by the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences in the Literary Monuments series (Demosthenes, Xenophon, Caesar, the letters of Cicero and Pliny, etc.) cannot meet the growing reader demand in terms of number of authors, selection of authors, or number of copies printed. Is it not clear that the time has come to publish mass editions not only of Russian and Western classics, but of such treasures of classical literature as the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, the dialogues of Lucian, the comedies of Plautus, *et al.*?

It cannot be considered normal that publishing houses reject scholarly manuscripts on classical philology on the grounds that they are not "timely." It is almost impossible to publish an article in our field even in journals of the Academy of Sciences or to get Moscow State University to publish a "Scholarly Notes" for our department.

Popularization of the ancient classics also suffers greatly from the fact that all translations of ancient authors in the State Literature Publishing House and U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences are in the hands of a very small number of people. This results in unjustifiable delays in publishing valuable books. . . . The attention of the Union of Soviet Writers should be directed toward translating ancient classics. The trouble is that there are fewer and fewer qualified translators who both know a classical language and have poetic talent.

Classical philology abroad enjoys a place of honor among the humanities. Our libraries receive dozens of monographs, anthologies, and journals published in the people's democracies [the Soviet term for Iron Curtain countries], in Great Britain, the U.S.A., France, etc. It is the duty of our libraries and information agencies to increase their subscriptions to such publications and prepare abstracts of them. . . .

Work in the field of classical philology has hardly begun. We urgently need studies of individual writers, of the theory and history of classical genres, of questions of clas-

sical realism, of typical and folk elements, of literary devices—of everything that makes the works of the classical writers lasting. It is particularly important to study the democratic line of development in classical literature. There are many important problems in classical linguistics. The philological study of Greek inscriptions on the northern Black Sea coast and the deciphering and translation of Latin documents in the archives in Lvov, Vilnius, Riga, and other cities in the western part of the Soviet Union are of direct value in studying our country's history.

Scholars themselves are partly responsible for the lag in classical philology, since they have expressed their dissatisfaction only in private, and have not raised their voices in defense of their field.

This is not a question of good intentions, of course. We feel that besides the suggestions mentioned above, a good practical measure to encourage classical philology and education would be a conference of scholars of Moscow, Leningrad, Lvov, and other university centers. Such a conference has long been due, and we can only regret that the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education has already rejected a proposal for such a conference. It is highly necessary to publish a special journal, even if it is small and not published frequently. The question of establishing a section on ancient languages in the Linguistics Institute of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences is urgent, since no serious scholarly work in comparative linguistics can be done without a study of these languages. It is necessary to reinstate fully the teaching of ancient classical literature and Latin in all liberal arts faculties of universities and teachers' colleges. It is also necessary to introduce Greek in the curricula of graduate linguistics students and Slavists. Finally, publishing houses must change their commercial and market-minded approach to manuscripts on classical literature, philosophy, esthetics, art, linguistics, etc. This is required in the interests of scholarship and in the interests of the liberal arts training of our youth.

### *Catullus: Nulli se dicit mulier*

My woman says she'd have me above  
even Jove, if he sought her.  
Write woman's words to her man in love  
in wind and swift water.

Indiana University

ROY A. SWANSON



## Livius Drusus, *t. p.* 122, and his Anti-Gracchan Program

HENRY C. BOREN

THE ATTITUDE of most historians of Rome toward Marcus Livius Drusus, tribune in 122 B.C., reflects that shown by Plutarch in his life of Gaius Gracchus. There Drusus is pictured as a mere tool of the senatorial clique that opposed Gracchus, who "brought forward laws that were neither honorable nor advantageous to the public—his whole design being to outdo Gaius in pleasing and cajoling the populace (as if it had been in some comedy) with obsequious flattery and every kind of gratification."<sup>1</sup> Most ancient writers are equally derogatory.

Nevertheless, there are scraps of evidence which seem to indicate that the elder Drusus was more of a statesman than Plutarch would have us believe. During his consulship in 112 he carried through an agrarian law regarding which we are not well informed, but several of its provisions were perpetuated in subsequent legislation, and his proposals affecting the Italian allies showed a more sympathetic understanding of their problems than did those of the Gracchi. The strong efforts of his son of the same name (*t. p.* 91) to help the Italians reflect the point of view of the father. It therefore seems proper to attempt a new appraisal of the older Drusus.

We may begin with a study of the political and family connections of Drusus' ancestors, along the lines suggested by Friedrich Münzer in his important *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*.<sup>2</sup> Of the important family-political factions in Rome, one quite obviously stood behind the Gracchi.<sup>3</sup> In the other, opposing faction, the Livii Drusi had a distinct place. Such groups, led by prominent members of the nobility are properly called factions,<sup>4</sup> for they were not parties in the modern sense. Their policies fluctuated and

their membership often changed. Our evidence regarding the affiliations of individuals is frequently inconclusive, and even if we know that a particular person or family was usually associated with one faction, we cannot be certain that he always followed the policy-makers of his group. Nevertheless, the evidence we have is of great value, for it often illuminates relationships which otherwise might pass unnoticed.

Two such family-political factions were struggling for dominance in the Gracchan period, one led by Appius Claudius Pulcher (*cos.* 143), the other by Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (*cos.* 147, 134). In most cases, the family alliances which made up these two factions can be traced back to, or even beyond, the Hannibalic war. Thus Scipio Aemilianus inherited leadership of the Aemilian-Scipionic group which had dominated Roman affairs for many years during and after the Second Punic War. In general, the members of this group were enlightened philhellenes. After a consideration of the available information, Scullard concludes that:

The evidence points in one direction and suggests that the Aemilian Scipionic group was a liberal progressive section of the senate which was . . . ready . . . to listen to the demands of the people, and that it was . . . tolerant of, or even co-operated with, the leaders whom the people put forward.<sup>5</sup>

Families which generally cooperated with the Scipionic-Aemilian alliance included the Livii, Veturii, Servillii, Papirii, and Pomponii.<sup>6</sup> The Claudian-Fulvian group, on the other hand, were opportunists, and always swinging their weight in the direction that seemed most profitable.

There was no epoch of Rome's history but could show a Claudius intolerably arrogant towards the nobles his rivals, or grasp-

ing personal power under cover of liberal politics.<sup>7</sup>

Generally allied with the Claudii and Fulvii were the Sempronii, Licinii, Mucii, and others.<sup>8</sup>

Members of the Claudian group during the second century showed themselves constantly interested in the colonization of northern Italy as a political expedient.<sup>9</sup> Unfortunately, it was also characteristic of this group that its leaders had a narrowly Roman point of view. We know of several instances when Claudian officials gave unfair treatment to Rome's allies.<sup>10</sup> It is obvious, therefore, that Tiberius Gracchus' measures were along traditional family lines. The Claudians backed him, hoping, of course, to gain political advantage from his program.

The Scipionians had no popular land program comparable to that of the Claudians, but neither did they have their record of shabby treatment of the allies. Perhaps the military experience of Scipionic leaders had taught the value of the Latin and Italian soldiery to Rome. It was not by mere chance, therefore, that when the Gracchan program threatened to injure the Italians they chose Aemilianus to defend their interests before the senate.

There is abundant evidence that the Livii Drusi had long had close ties with the Aemilian-Scipionic faction. Our fullest summary of the ancestry of the Livius Drusus who was tribune in 122 is found in Suetonius (Tib. 3). The Livii, we learn, were of plebeian origin yet of great prominence. They had held eight consulships, two censorships, one dictatorship, and one Livius had been *magister equitum*. Three times the family had been awarded triumphs. Although some of these honors came later than our period, the family was fully accepted as part of the lesser nobility of Rome long before the Gracchan age, as is attested by their early election to high office. It was in 324 that a Livius Drusus was made *magister equitum*.<sup>11</sup> Probably the *gens* was of Latin

nobility which was admitted to Roman citizenship in the reorganization of 338.<sup>12</sup> M. Livius Denter was consul in 302 and became one of the first plebeian pontifices.<sup>13</sup> Another Livius Drusus was elected praetor about 282.<sup>14</sup>

The major family of the *gens* bore the cognomen Drusus in this early period, and not until late in the third century did one member of the family take the name Salinator.<sup>15</sup> According to Livy,<sup>16</sup> this name was given to the Marcus Livius who served as censor in 204 because he levied a salt tax. Salinator was closely connected with the Aemilian-Scipionic group. He was supported for his second consulship (207) as a kind of counterbalance to Gaius Claudius Nero, whose election seemed assured.<sup>17</sup> Linked again as censors in 204, the two quarrelled bitterly and disfranchised each other!<sup>18</sup> One other event in the life of Salinator is of high significance for the policies of the Livii at a later period. At some date before 216 he married the daughter of Pacuvius Calavius, a leading noble of Capua. Such a marriage undoubtedly brought a considerable dowry, probably including large landed estates in Campania. This would give the Livii strong interests in anything affecting that region thereafter.<sup>19</sup> The son of Salinator, Gaius Livius Salinator, maintaining his father's political alliances, lost a consular election in 192, but was elected to the office four years later as the Aemilian-Scipionic faction rode the crest of the wave of popularity after the victory of Africanus and his brother Lucius at Magnesia.<sup>20</sup> Thereafter for many years—years of eclipse for the Scipionic group—no Livius reached high office.

The Livius who again took the name Drusus, the grandfather of the Livius with whom we are chiefly concerned, is of more immediate interest. This man is known to us only by a mention in the *fasti* as father of the consul of 147. He was Marcus Livius Aemilianus. Born to the patrician Aemilius family,

he was by a most unusual adoption received into the plebeian Livian *gens*.<sup>21</sup> Münzer believed that this man's real father was the Lucius Aemilius Paulus killed at Cannae, that he was a brother to the victor of Pydna, and that he was adopted by Marcus Livius Salinator, consul with Paulus in 219 and son-in-law of Pacuvius Calavius.<sup>22</sup> So unusual an adoption emphasizes the close relationship between the families which is of great importance in the later history of the Livii. If Münzer's conjecture is correct, the consuls of 147, Gaius Livius Drusus and Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (who of course was a son of Aemilius Paulus, victor of Pydna) were first cousins. In any event, close political connection of the two is obvious, and blood relationship seems probable.<sup>23</sup> Finally, the relationship between the two families is confirmed by a marriage of the consul Livius' son—the subject of this paper—to a Cornelia, presumably a relative of Scipio Aemilianus.<sup>24</sup>

In summary, it may be seen that the Livii were long-standing members of the Aemilian-Scipionic coalition. Connected with these families in election to office, they were able to gain official position when the Scipionic star was high, unable to reach high office when the Scipionic fortunes declined. Before the beginning of the second century there were also blood and marriage connections between the Livii and Aemilii. Moreover, the Livii had long had economic and family ties with Campania which may have given a broader sympathy with the Italians and a better understanding of their problems than those of many Romans of the day.

Leadership in the war against Perseus put the Scipionic faction back into power after an interval of nearly twenty years, and there it remained, virtually unchallenged, until about 140. During the first part of this period, the most eminent man at Rome was Aemilius Lepidus, a distant cousin of

Paulus; after his death leadership fell to Scipio Aemilianus. Young Livius Drusus, born about 156,<sup>25</sup> was therefore reared at the very heart of the dominant faction. We have seen that he married a Cornelia, probably a relative of Scipio Aemilianus. With such a background it is not surprising that he should have been elected tribune in 122, with the support of the Scipionic faction, as a check to Gaius Gracchus.

When they can rise above Gracchan prejudices, the ancient authors usually speak well of Drusus. Diodorus, for example, characterizes him as "renowned";<sup>26</sup> Cicero says he was "a man of weight and influence both in speech and personal effectiveness."<sup>27</sup> Even Plutarch, escaping from his Gracchan source, remarks that he "was not inferior to any Roman either in birth or rearing, while in character, eloquence, and wealth he could vie with those who were most honored and influential in consequence of these advantages."<sup>28</sup> By descent, connections, and training, Drusus was well fitted for a successful career.

Survey textbooks still ordinarily picture Gaius Gracchus, in the likeness of his brother, as an idealistic democrat whose only desire was to help the poor displaced peasants in Rome<sup>29</sup> and to take the bad, snobbish aristocrats down a peg or two. But the revolutionary character of Gaius' proposals have long been recognized. "What Gaius introduced in a series of separate proposals was nothing else than an entirely new constitution."<sup>30</sup> Of his program Hugh Last says, "The expedients employed . . . implied the destruction of the equilibrium between the magistrates and the development in its place of an unfettered democracy. . . ."<sup>31</sup> These "expedients" were measures designed to put the equestrians—who benefited most from his laws—at odds with the senate. To the aristocrats, such measures must have seemed to foreshadow tyranny.

Apparently Gaius passed an agrarian

law like that of his brother, but surely little land suitable for virgane allotment now was available for distribution. His grain law provided wheat at about half price to the Roman poor, and he caused roads and granaries to be constructed to assure constant supplies of food. He gave the right of *provocatio* (appeal) to citizens under the death penalty. He arranged that soldiers were to be provided with uniforms, and that no one under seventeen was to be conscripted.

More important constitutionally was the series of highly significant proposals designed to strengthen Gracchus' own position at the expense of the senatorial oligarchy by completely detaching the equestrians from allegiance to the nobles. One law, highly lucrative for the equestrian class, provided for the *publicani*, or tax farmers, soon to become infamous, who contracted to collect the taxes in the new province of Asia. A much maligned law was passed to revise the extortion courts; in the future all jurors were to be chosen from the equestrian order. Gracchus could plead the all-too-obvious corruption which in recent years had given the court a bad name.<sup>32</sup> Gracchus is said to have declared that by this measure he had broken the power of the senate for all time. A law *ne quis iudicio circumveniretur*, against the bribing of jurors, was perhaps enacted early in Gracchus' first year in office. Its provisions made it applicable only against senator-jurors, presumably because at this time there were no others. But Gracchus did not change this law to make its provisions binding upon the new jurors.<sup>33</sup> Another section of this law, the *Lex Acilia*, was probably designed to improve relations with the Latins. It provided that any non-citizen obtaining a conviction under the law could become a Roman citizen. Any Latin who in such case did not desire citizenship was to be given the right of *provocatio*.<sup>34</sup>

The colonies that Gracchus now pro-

posed to send out, perhaps to locations in Italy, and by the *Lex Rubria* to Carthage, were far from being mere extensions of Tiberius' schemes to give land to the Roman proletariat. Gracchus chose sites suitable for commercial development. He sent "citizens of the better sort"<sup>35</sup> and, at least at Carthage, he gave his colonists large enough allotments to make them "gentlemen farmers."<sup>36</sup> "Gracchus' object may have been to choose his new colonists from the *equites*, and to make these new colonies centers of business and trade as well as of agriculture."<sup>37</sup> The equestrians might also be expected to benefit from the considerable construction program in and near Rome which Gracchus initiated, building new granaries, roads, and bridges.

One of the more unfortunate results of Tiberius Gracchus' agrarian program had been to arouse widespread disaffection among the Italian allies through reclaiming of Roman *ager* which was held by Italian cities or which had never before been formally possessed by Rome. Such land was often still in the hands of the original Italian owners or of those who had purchased such land in good faith. Gaius Gracchus' program was similar enough to cause a renewal of this protest. Such a threat to good relations would naturally be of concern to the Scipionians, as it had previously been to Aemilianus.

Gracchus' proposal to give the franchise to the Latins, which came, perhaps, late in his first year of office or early in the second, would be suspected by opponents as designed to strengthen his position at the polls.<sup>38</sup> As a member of the agrarian commission he not long before had disregarded the rights of the allies; presumably he had good reason for so abrupt a change in tactics. From the point of view of the senatorial aristocrats, Gracchus was the opportunistic Claudian at his worst.

It is not, therefore, necessary to hold that all of the opponents of Gaius Grac-

chus were near-sighted reactionaries. It is understandable that many sober-minded men, even of liberal views, would consider Gaius as a dangerous and irresponsible demagogue. To them he seemed motivated by a desire for revenge and a lust for power. Opposition, to be effective, must be on Gaius' own ground. A program must be put forward appealing to other needs of the Roman people and, incidentally, of the allies. An acceptable spokesman, neither a dupe nor a "front," was found in Marcus Livius Drusus, a Scipionic tribune for 122.

Drusus apparently began his anti-Gracchan career by vetoing legislation proposed by Gaius Gracchus;<sup>39</sup> then he offered a program of his own, designed to deal with the major difficulties which had given rise to — or resulted from — the Gracchan program. His plans were backed not only by his own Scipionic faction but also by other groups which opposed Gracchus. Briefly, the major, immediate problems which Drusus faced were these: something had to be done for the submerged proletariat at Rome; some concession must be made to reassure the Latins and Italians, whose dissatisfaction was in large part due to the Gracchan land distributions; and finally, the senate, to regain the good will of the people, must confirm the land distributions already made. Guided by these considerations, Drusus presented his program, which was a carefully planned whole — not, as Plutarch indicates, a piecemeal reply to Gracchus' measures. The components of the program were a colonization scheme, a law to confirm previous land distributions with full rights of ownership (but obviously intended to end such distributions) and last, a law to protect Latins against irresponsible and encroaching magistrates.

Of the Gracchan laws, the senators must have been most perturbed by the subsidized distribution of grain. By this largess, Gracchus not only made friends; he also kept them in Rome,

where their votes were important in the *comitia*. Drusus' colonial law was probably alternative to this food distribution rather than to Gracchus' colonial schemes, as Plutarch thought; Gracchus' colonies, as we have seen, were of a very different type and for a different purpose. Drusus' law proposed to benefit the poorer classes at Rome.<sup>40</sup> There were to be twelve colonies of three thousand persons each. Drusus has often been accused of bad faith in this colonial scheme, and its passage is regarded as a mere sop to gain the Roman mob. "It is as certain as anything in this period can be that the twelve colonies . . . authorized were never founded,"<sup>41</sup> says one authority. Others have suggested that the law was passed but remained a dead letter until the action of the younger Livius Drusus in his tribunate in 91 B.C.<sup>42</sup> It is probable, indeed, that twelve colonies of the size proposed were never established, but it is likely that *Scolacium Minervium* was planted under this law,<sup>43</sup> and it is even possible that all twelve colonies were established in some form.<sup>44</sup>

Our sources do not make it clear where Drusus hoped to plant his colonies. If the colonial ventures of his son were undertaken under his father's law (which is doubtful), the colonies were to be in Italy and Sicily.<sup>45</sup> It has been suggested that out-of-the-way strips of public land not considered suitable for individual assignment under the Gracchan law were to be used.<sup>46</sup> In any case it may be considered certain that Drusus would not have proposed a repetition of the Gracchan methods which had caused trouble with the Latin and Italian allies as well as with Rome's aristocratic landowners. The colonial proposal won the approval of the Roman lower classes. Drusus' personal good faith seemed demonstrated by the fact that he drew no personal benefit from the law and was not to be on the administrative commission, as the Gracchi had been.<sup>47</sup>



Further light may be shed on Drusus' colonial plans by his financial policy. It seems that he may at this time have debased the coinage. He is said to have mixed an eighth of bronze with the silver in the denarius.<sup>48</sup> Harold Mattingly attributes the act to this Drusus rather than to his son, contrary to the usual opinion. His reasoning is this: Vitruvius (3. 1. 8) speaks of an "*aeracius*" denarius which was equivalent to sixteen asses. This retariffing of the denarius at sixteen asses took place sometime about the Gracchan period. Hence it is likely that the retariffing and the issuance of a "coppery" denarius took place at the same time. This debased denarius may be the issue spoken of in Pliny, and if so, he was speaking of the elder Drusus rather than the younger.

This debasement would benefit the landholding classes by reducing the amount of any debts secured by mortgages and, as Mattingly points out,<sup>49</sup> it would also shift the burden of paying for Drusus' colonial schemes (and Gracchus' too, for that matter) to the shoulders of the creditor classes. Since Drusus represented the noble landowners, many of whom had fallen heavily into debt, whereas Gracchus was allied with the moneyed equestrians, this theory seems plausible — if we may safely assume, with Mattingly, that the Romans understood the effects of tampering with the coinage.<sup>50</sup> In any event, Mattingly's researches give additional indication of Drusus' real intention to carry out the colonial scheme. If he issued such debased coins, it presumably was in order to finance his program.

A second proposal of Drusus, designed to confirm the previous land distributions, reassured those who saw in his senate-backed program an effort to undo what good had been accomplished by the Gracchan land commission. His measure abolished the rental (*vectigal*) which Tiberius Gracchus had required the recipients of such lands to pay to

the state, thereby making the holdings private and saleable.<sup>51</sup> A general understanding that this law was to bring an end to such land distributions may safely be inferred. This, of course, would quiet the fears of the Italians.

The next point in Drusus' program was his measure to forbid the beating of Latins by Roman magistrates, even in the army.<sup>52</sup> This bill was perhaps a proposal to extend the *ius provocacionis* to the Latins.<sup>53</sup> The Latin who lived at a distance from Rome might well regard this right of appeal, one of the more important benefits conferred by Roman citizenship, as preferable to the citizenship itself. This law extended to Latins a right granted to citizens not long before.<sup>54</sup> Plutarch implies that Drusus' law was intended as a counter to Gracchus' proposal to enfranchise the Latins, but since Drusus' bills have the earmarks of a unified program while Gracchus' later proposals were desperation moves, the reverse seems more likely.<sup>55</sup>

Drusus' sympathy for the position of the Italians was further demonstrated in a law passed in the year of his consulship, 112. A change in the existing agrarian legislation was enacted, granting privileges to the Latins and other non-citizens with respect to the public land.<sup>56</sup> Greenidge<sup>57</sup> confidently assigns this legislation to Drusus. This section of the law of 112, incorporated the next year in the definitive law of 111, was obviously designed to guarantee non-Romans rights which had been infringed upon by the Gracchan land commissions. It certainly was not the work of a mere demagogue. Unfortunately we know nothing more of significance to this question in Drusus' later career.

Near the end of 122 Gracchus brought forward a sweeping proposal, a revival of Fulvius' effort of 125, to extend Roman citizenship to the Latin and Italian allies.<sup>58</sup> Last points out that it is possible that the confusion in our sources as to Gracchus' intentions regarding citizenship for the Latins and



Italians is due to the fact that the measure actually called for citizenship for the Latins and Latin rights for the Italians.<sup>59</sup> This move revived the fears of the nobles that the votes of the new citizens (many of those eligible already lived in Rome) might permanently upset the political balance of power. The opposition accordingly marshaled all its forces to prevent the passage of this bill. The highly respected Scipionic consul Gaius Fannius made a speech against it in which he appealed to the selfish interests of the Roman populace. He suggested that on the days of the games, or on feast days, the Latins might crowd out the citizens. "*Nonne illos omnia occupaturos putatis?*"<sup>60</sup>

The most important step taken against Gracchus' proposal for citizenship came as the result of the influx of large numbers of non-citizens into the city to support the measure. It may well be asked what kind of support Gracchus might get from these people. The answer is that in such troublous times violence and sheer force of numbers — even of non-citizens — determined the voting. The problem of determining qualified voters may have been complicated by excessively large crowds, and unauthorized persons may have been permitted to vote. At any rate, the senate, aroused by the large numbers of non-citizens entering the city, passed a drastic measure to exclude all these persons from an area within five miles of Rome during the voting on the proposed legislation.<sup>61</sup> Gaius attempted to defy the edict, but would not use violence in opposing it, and his objections were disregarded. His bill failed to pass the *comitia*.

It is often said that Drusus bested Gracchus by offering more than the latter could give.<sup>62</sup> The remarkable thing is that Livius succeeded in gaining so much popular support while offering so little. Livius offered the Roman people a colonization scheme which would give a few of them land free from rent, and he eliminated the

*vectigal* for land distributed under the Gracchan laws. There is evidence that most Roman proletarians had no desire to return to the soil, and, in any event, this measure would have benefited only a few. Did this offer more than Gracchus' corn distributions to all the Roman poor at half price or less, and the stimulus to employment provided by the laws to build roads and granaries, plus benefits for those in army service and other similar measures? Judging from past performance, even more could have been expected from Gaius, if he had been re-elected. The main reason for Gaius' loss of support was not that Drusus offered more, but that the people preferred to follow the senate as long as it considered their needs. They still had great respect for the Scipionic group, and not a little of Drusus' influence was due to his close connection with that faction. Moreover, there was an underlying distrust of the motives of Gracchus, and especially of Fulvius. Perhaps it was thought that these leaders catered too much to the *equites*, and that their Italian proposals did not seem entirely sincere.

The evidence thus indicates that Drusus was an enlightened man of broad interests who advanced a limited but workable program to meet the pressing problems of his time. The Livian program now seems quite inadequate as a general settlement of the many economic, social, and political problems which caused the crisis, but it was as broad and intelligent a program as could have been expected from the senatorial aristocracy. The fact that it satisfied the people speaks volumes. It certainly accomplished its secondary purpose of alienating large numbers of Gracchan supporters, and the senate — or that faction which Drusus represented — regained its *auctoritas*.

This interpretation of the motives and program of Livius Drusus makes it appear that his son of the same name, the tribune of 91, instead of following

the precedent of the Gracchi and Saturninus (as is so often said) was really following in his father's footsteps. The program of the younger Drusus, composed of *leges agrariae*, *leges coloniae*, a *lex frumentaria*, a reconstitution of the senate by including many equestrians (intended to solve the vexing problem of the extortion court juries) plus citizenship for all Italians, was designed, like his father's program — though on a much larger scale — as a general settlement of the most pressing problems of his day. The younger Drusus' program was Cicero's *concordia ordinum* at a time when it might have worked.

It was unfortunate for the republic that the senate, by failing to follow through on programs like those of the Drusi, virtually abdicated its leadership of the state to the "popular" leaders and the way of Sulla and of Pompey and Caesar.

Southern Illinois University

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *C. Gr.* 9.  
<sup>2</sup> Stuttgart, 1920. Many of the more useful articles of a prosopographical nature in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* also are by Münzer. He in turn depended extensively on the researches of W. Drumann and P. Groebe in *Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung*, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (Berlin, 1899-1929). M. Gelzer, in *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik* (Leipzig, 1912) contributed to the field. There is an excellent recent book, H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.* (Oxford, 1951). Unfortunately, none of these works covers the Gracchan period in detail.

<sup>3</sup> For the importance of such party-factions in this political crisis see R. Syme, *JRS* 34 (1914) 104 and K. Bilz, "Die Politik des P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus," *Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft* 7 (1936) 66.

<sup>4</sup> See the discussion of this question, together with bibliographical notes, in L. R. Taylor, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* (Berkeley, 1949) pp. 6 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Scullard, *Roman Politics*, p. 55. But see the review of Scullard by J. W. Swain, *CP* 48 (1953) 33-35, in which Scullard's loose application of the largely meaningless term "liberal" is criticized.

<sup>6</sup> Scullard, pp. 35 f.; Münzer, *Röm. Adels.*, pp. 224 ff. for the Cornelii, 155 ff. for the Aemilii, 225 ff. for the Livii, 160 ff. for the Papirii and Pomponii, 123 ff. for the Veturi, and 132 ff. for the Servilii.

<sup>7</sup> R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939) p. 19.

<sup>8</sup> Scullard, pp. 37, 165 ff.; Münzer, *Röm. Adels.*, pp. 267 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Liv. 39. 44. 10-11; 39. 55; 40. 11. 4 (Aemilius Lepidus was at this time cooperating with the Claudian faction; see Scullard, pp. 179 ff.).

<sup>10</sup> In allotments of land to colonists, Liv. 40. 11. 4; in division of spoils of war, Liv. 41. 13; in stripping a temple in Bruttium for a Roman building, Liv. 42. 3. The father of the Gracchi, associated with this group, as aedile burdened the Latin and Italian allies with heavy expenses for games in Rome, Liv. 40. 44. 12. When he triumphed as consul, however, he gave allied soldiers equal amounts with the Romans, Liv. 41. 7. 3. This Gracchus demonstrated his opposition to the Scipios in the elections for 162 B.C. See the references in T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. 1 (New York, 1951) p. 442.

<sup>11</sup> CIL, vol. 1, part 2, p. 130; cf. Münzer, *RE*, vol. 13, 853; Broughton, vol. 1, p. 149.

<sup>12</sup> Münzer, *RE*, vol. 13, 810.

<sup>13</sup> Liv. 10. 1. 7; 10. 9. 2.

<sup>14</sup> Münzer, *RE*, vol. 13, 854.

<sup>15</sup> This branch of the family is called Drusus by Vergil, indicating that the Drusi and Salinatore were of the same family branch: *Aen.* 6. 824; Münzer, *Röm. Adels.*, p. 235.

<sup>16</sup> 29. 37.

<sup>17</sup> Liv. 27. 34.

<sup>18</sup> Liv. 29. 37; *Aur. Vict. Vir.* III. 50.

<sup>19</sup> Liv. 23. 2; 35. 13.

<sup>20</sup> Liv. 38. 35. Another better known Scipionian, Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, would probably have been chosen consul in Livius' place had not Q. Fulvius, the consul in charge of the elections, opposed him so bitterly. Or perhaps (Scullard, p. 165) both consuls would have been chosen from the Scipionic group but for Fulvius.

<sup>21</sup> See the comments of Theodor Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1864) vol. 1, p. 75, n. 9.

<sup>22</sup> *RE*, vol. 13, 855.

<sup>23</sup> Some evidence of political opposition might be deduced from the fact that Livius proposed casting lots for the African command (*App. Bell. Pun.* 112) although the people evidently had chosen Scipio for the post and insisted he take it. Münzer (*Röm. Adels.*, p. 235) says the procedure was a mere formality. Even if it were not, the move need not be interpreted to mean general opposition. Livius was of consular age, as Scipio was not, and it may have seemed natural and best to him that he should be given opportunity via the lot to exercise the general command.

<sup>24</sup> Seneca, *Cons. Marc.* 16. 4.

<sup>25</sup> Münzer, *Röm. Adels.*, pp. 312 f.; cf. *Cic. De Fin.* 4. 66.

<sup>26</sup> 37. 10. 21.

<sup>27</sup> *Brut.* 109.

<sup>28</sup> *C. Gr.* 8.

<sup>29</sup> Incidentally, it is very unlikely that a large percentage of the urban poor had ever lived on farms. The migration to the city had been going on for at least a century and for varied reasons. Probably the city proletariat had grown rapidly in Rome for reasons which mainly were not very different from those which cause slum population growth in any other large city in almost any age.

<sup>30</sup> T. Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, trans. W. P. Dickson, 4 vols. (New York, 1889) vol. 3, p. 126.

<sup>31</sup> *CAH*, vol. 9, pp. 91 f.

<sup>32</sup> A convenient summary of information relative to this court may be found in J. P. V. D. Balsdon,

"The History of the Extortion Court at Rome, 123-70 B.C.," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 14, New Series 1 (1938) 98-114.

<sup>33</sup> The exact chronology of these laws is a matter of speculation. See Last, *CAH*, vol. 9, pp. 49 ff.; cf. Warde Fowler, "Notes on Gaius Gracchus," *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 20 (1905) 218 ff. It has been suggested that Gracchus at first did not intend to exclude senators from the juries, but only to enlarge the senate by the inclusion of large numbers of equestrians; see Last, p. 70, who bases his conclusion on *Liv. Per.* 6). For an extended discussion of Gracchus and the equites, see H. Hill, *The Roman Middle Class in the Republican Period* (Oxford, 1952).

<sup>34</sup> See *CIL*, vol. 1, part 1, 198, line 78. Translation is given in E. G. Hardy, *Roman Laws and Charters* (Oxford, 1912) p. 33. This is the first known mention of the right of obtaining citizenship *per magistratum* (a privilege extended to those who had been elected to office in Latin city-states), although this may be merely confirmation of earlier legislation. See H. F. Jolowicz, *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law* (Cambridge, Eng., 1932) p. 60. The law may have been a concession to the disturbed Latins after the crisis which culminated in the revolt and destruction of Fregellae, 125. This legislation, Jolowicz suggests, replaced the previous rights of the Latins to obtain citizenship *per migrationem et census*, which had long been curtailed.

<sup>35</sup> *Plut. C. Gr.* 9.

<sup>36</sup> These colonists were given up to 200 *iugera*. See *Lex Agraria*, 111 B.C., *CIL* vol. 1, part 1, 200, line 60.

<sup>37</sup> Fowler, *op. cit.* (see note 33) 226.

<sup>38</sup> Although Latins receiving citizenship had up to this time been forced to vote in a single tribe, Gracchus' opponents would suspect an intention to attempt, at a later time, to scatter their votes throughout the tribes. The Claudian group had done this in the case of well-to-do freedmen-citizens in 179 (*Liv.* 40. 15. 1).

<sup>39</sup> *App. Bell. Civ.* 1. 23.

<sup>40</sup> *Plut. C. Gr.* 9; *App. Bell. Civ.* 1. 23. In the latter, the Loeb series translates *ton apóron* "needy citizens," but the text does not restrict the colonists to citizens and it is possible that members of the lower classes including Latins and Italians were to be taken.

<sup>41</sup> Last, *CAH*, vol. 9, p. 72.

<sup>42</sup> *App. Bell. Civ.* 1. 36.

<sup>43</sup> *Vell.* 1. 12. 4-5; W. E. Heitland, *The Roman Republic* 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1909) vol. 2, p. 317; K. J. Beloch, *Der Italische Bund unter Roms Hegemonie* (Leipzig, 1880) p. 63; G. Bloch and J. Carcopino, *Des Gracques à Sulla* (Paris, 1935) pp. 255 f.; T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. 1, *Rome and Italy of the Republic* (Baltimore, 1933) p. 219.

<sup>44</sup> Bloch and Carcopino, p. 255, n. 58. Carcopino here notes that exactly twelve colonies date from this period, if we include Scolacium Minervium, Tarentum, Capua, and Dertona, plus eight others mentioned in the *Libri Colonialium* as of Gracchan origin. See also K. J. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1926) pp. 494 f., who notes that more colonies than the two named by Velleius (1. 15. 4—Minervia Scolacium and Nepuntia Tarentum) may have been founded under Drusus' law.

<sup>45</sup> *App. Bell. Civ.* 1. 36.

<sup>46</sup> Bloch and Carcopino, p. 256.

<sup>47</sup> *Plut. C. Gr.* 10. It is possible that the practice of the Gracchi in this respect may have been illegal (*Cic. De Lege Agr.* 2. 8. 21) though Mommsen thinks the law mentioned by Cicero may have been passed later as the result of the Gracchan methods (*Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3rd. ed., 3 vols. [Leipzig, 1887-1888] vol. 1, p. 501, n. 2).

<sup>48</sup> *Plin. N. H.* 33. 13. For the opinions of Mattingly in the rest of the paragraph, see "The Retarding of the Denarius at Sixteen Asses," *Numis. Chron.* 14 (1934) 89; and "Some Historical Coins of the Late Republic," *JRS* 12 (1922) 232.

<sup>49</sup> *Roman Coins* (New York, 1928) p. 95.

<sup>50</sup> Mattingly extends the theory in an ingenious, if not wholly convincing, fashion by depicting Gracchus and the various "popular" leaders who followed him, at least to the time of Sulla, as "sound money" men due to their alliance with the moneyed interests. The senatorial land-holding group, on the other hand, always favored debasement to reduce their debts. Mattingly bases most of his speculation on the dates of the various issues of the much-discussed serrate (notched) denarii, which correspond to the periods when the so-called "popular" party was in power. He thinks the coins were serrated as "palpable evidence that the new coinage was pure silver." See esp. *Roman Coins*, pp. 95-105. Cf. E. A. Sydenham, "The Origin of the Roman Serrati," *Numis. Chron.* 15 (1935) 209-230, who disagrees with Mattingly, pointing out the existence of large numbers of plated serrati struck by official moneyers. Sydenham thinks the serrate denarii were issued for trade with the barbarians to the north. For other of Mattingly's researches, see references in preceding notes and also "The Various Styles of the Roman Republican Coinage," *Numis. Chron.* 33 (1949) 57-74.

<sup>51</sup> T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1923) p. 27, believes that this vestigial was released only in the case of those who received land in one of the colonies founded in accordance with Drusus' bill. *Appian (Bell. Civ.* 1. 27) states that a law allowing the sale of such property was passed after the death of Ti. Gracchus. Carcopino (Bloch and Carcopino, p. 255) considers the abolition of the rental a sly preparation for re-absorption of the small allotments of land by the large landholders. It is quite likely that most of the new small-holders were eager to sell.

<sup>52</sup> *Plut. C. Gr.* 9.

<sup>53</sup> A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1939) p. 28.

<sup>54</sup> The conclusion of A. H. McDonald, "Rome and the Italian Confederation (200-186 B.C.)," *JRS* 24 (1944) 19, notes 70-72. The *Lex Porcia* of about 190 B.C. he thinks did not apply to citizens on army duty.

<sup>55</sup> Fowler, *op. cit.* (see note 33) 424, thinks Drusus' proposal may have been in answer to a bill of Gracchus which would only have extended the Latin vote at Rome (i.e., presumably the vote of the Latins who had become citizens by the *ius migrationis* or otherwise) over all the thirty-five tribes. In favor of the broader view, however, is the mention in Gellius (10.3) of an oration by Gaius in which he complained of magisterial mistreatment of certain inhabitants of some municipal towns.

<sup>56</sup> Incorporated in the *Lex Agraria* of 111, line 29. It is not clear just what these privileges were.

See Hardy, *Roman Laws*, p. 65.

<sup>57</sup> A. H. J. Greenidge, *A History of Rome from the Tribune of Tiberius Gracchus to the End of the Jugurthine War*, a.c. 133-104 (London, 1904) p. 238.

<sup>58</sup> Vell. 2. 6. 2; Plut. C. Gr. 5; App. Bell. Civ. 1. 23.

<sup>59</sup> CAH, vol. 9, p. 79; cf. Greenidge, *History*, p. 233.

<sup>60</sup> Jul. Victor 6. 4. For the exact identification of Fannius, see Münzer, *RE*, vol. 6, 1987 ff., and Broughton, vol. 1, p. 519, n. 2, with the bibliographical material given there. Fannius is often pictured as a betrayer of Gracchus. It is true that

Gracchus threw his support in the consular elections to Fannius (Plut. C. Gr. 8), but Gracchus would naturally support any of the Scipionic group against his enemy, Opimius (Plut. C. Gr. 11). Fannius was a son-in-law of Laellus and had served under Aemilius in 146. When he stood for consul, he was no doubt glad to have the support of Gracchus in a tight election, but no close alliance is indicated, and to call a highly respected Scipionic consul a "protégé" (Greenidge, *History*, p. 235) of the young tribune Gracchus is certainly misleading.

<sup>61</sup> App. Bell. Civ. 1. 23; Plut. C. Gr. 12.

<sup>62</sup> E.g., Taylor, *Party Politics*, p. 16.

### Lucretius 1. 1-25

Creatress-mother of the Roman line,  
Dear Venus, joy of earth and joy of heaven,  
All things that live below that heraldry  
Of star and planet, whose processional  
Moves ever slow and solemn over us,  
All things conceived, all things that face the light  
In their bright visit, the grain-bearing fields,  
The marinered oceans, where the wind and cloud  
Are quiet in your presence, — all proclaim  
Your gift, without whom they are nothingness.  
For you that sweet artificer, the earth,  
Submits her flowers, and for you the deep  
Of ocean smiles, and the calm heaven shines  
With shoreless light. Ah, goddess, when the spring  
Makes clear its daytime, and a warmer wind  
Stirs from the west a procreative air,  
High in the sky the happy-hearted birds,  
Responsive to your advent, wheel and cry,  
The cattle, tame no longer, skip and bound  
In happy meadows; where your brightness leads  
They follow, taken gladly, in the drive,  
The urge, of coaxing love. So, on you move,  
Over the seas and mountains, over streams  
Whose ways are fierce, over the greening leas,  
Over the leafy tenements of birds,  
So moving that in all the ardor moves  
Toward generation and their kind's increase.  
Since you alone control the way things are,  
Since, without you, no thing has ever come  
Forth to the holy boundaries of light,  
Since, without you, no thing is ever glad  
And nothing ever lovable, I need,  
I need you with me, goddess, in the verse  
I try to write, about *The Way Things Are*. . . .

ROLFE HUMPHRIES

Jackson Heights, New York

## Significant Action in the Symposium

ROGER HORNSBY

PLATO DESIGNED his dialogue called the *Symposium* so that it would be seen through several pairs of eyes. The dialogue opens with Apollodorus reporting to an unnamed friend a conversation he recently had with another friend, Glaucon, about the same topic—the famous banquet at which Socrates talked about Love. Apollodorus indicates that he is narrating second hand the report Aristodemus had given him of the dinner. Apollodorus, furthermore, adds the detail that he had checked Aristodemus' account with Socrates himself and had verified the report.

It has been argued that this opening scene with Apollodorus indicates a desire on Plato's part to create an illusion of verisimilitude. Although this may be true it seems like a complicated way to achieve such an illusion. I should like to suggest that Plato had something more in mind when he wrote in this fashion the account of the dinner at Agathon's.

The consummate artistry of this dialogue has long been noted: the interweaving of words and phrases from one speech to another; the expansion by Socrates of concepts and ideas from the earlier speeches of Phaedrus, Pausanias, Eryximachus, Aristophanes, and Agathon; and the illustration of Socrates' discourse on Love by Alcibiades' panegyric on Socrates.<sup>1</sup> On the verbal level alone it is evident that the artistry is conscious on Plato's part.

But what has not been so closely noted is the construction of the dialogue beginning with the opening scene. As much conscious craft is shown in the organization of the dia-

logue as in the speeches themselves. The dialogue is constructed around a central event: the reporting by Socrates of his instruction from Diotima. The banquet is the occasion for the reporting by Socrates. The dinner in turn is reported by a witness, Aristodemus, to another person, Apollodorus, who in turn reports it to Glaucon and another friend. Finally, there is the reporting of the event by Plato, the writer of the dialogue. Thus we see the core of the dinner, Diotima's instruction, through four pairs of eyes. It is as though a picture were framed, then enclosed in another frame, then another, and still another. Or to vary the metaphor, a series of boxes encloses successively smaller boxes. Among other things achieved by such an arrangement is a removal of the event from the present, that is from the present of Aristodemus, or Apollodorus, or even Plato. An aesthetic distance is achieved, so that we are encouraged to look upon the event as far off and long ago. This point is made at the very start by Apollodorus who places the dinner at some years before his time with Socrates (172 C). But although such a distance be achieved, nevertheless in reading the dialogue one is made immediately aware of the event. We have the illusion of being present. This dichotomy between our intellectual awareness and our emotional involvement is, I suspect, intentional. My reasons for such a suspicion will become apparent, I trust, as we consider one of the metaphors of the dialogue and its relationship to the Socrates-Diotima speech.

Apollodorus in his opening remarks (172 A ff.) states that Glaucon met him the day before yesterday as he was walking to Athens. As they walked along Apollodorus related the tale of the dinner. In the account Aristodemus

This paper was presented to the Classical Association of the Middle West and South at its Lexington meeting, April, 1956.



is reported to have met Socrates coming from the bath, wearing fine clothes and shoes. Socrates suggested that Aristodemus walk with him to Agathon's party and indeed become a guest. Later in the dialogue (212 C ff.) Alcibiades arrives, drunk, at the party. He walks in and in a sense takes over. Subsequent to his panegyric another group of revellers enters Agathon's house (223 B) and effectively disposes of the conversation. Finally, the last sentence of the dialogue records how Socrates walked away to his bath and the Lyceum and at last went home to bed. Throughout each of these acts walking is the essential point. There is movement towards or away from something and there is a consequence to that movement.

In the speeches of the guests at the dinner, lovers are spoken of as in pursuit of the beloved (Pausanias), or love is spoken of as moving men and nature (Eryximachus), or as searching after a beloved (Aristophanes), or as entering the souls of men and inspiring them (Agathon). Even Alcibiades speaks of his pursuit of Socrates. The purpose of the references to pursuit and movement on the part of love and lovers and of the insistence upon the walking of Apollodorus, Aristodemus, Alcibiades, the revellers, and Socrates becomes apparent in the Socrates-Diotima speech. The description of walking is not simply a detail to create an illusion of reality, but also a significant gesture which illuminates the whole concept of love and Plato's intention in the dialogue. Socrates reports what Diotima told him about Love. Love is a great *daimon*, half way between mortals and immortals (202 D), whose function is to interpret and convey messages from gods to men and men to gods (202 E). Love desires to pursue the Good so that it may have the everlasting possession of it (204 D ff.). It is the agent which best helps man to attain to the Idea of Beauty which is

eternal, absolute, unique, neither undergoing increase or diminution, nor suffering any change. Love then is movement, walking. The lover rightly searches for, hunts out, the beloved which is unmoving. But there is walking and there is walking.

The Idea of Beauty, Diotima tells Socrates, is reached through a series of progressions (she uses the verb *iénai* repeatedly, 209 E ff.) along a path upward. The stages along this path are physical beauty, beauty of soul, beauty of sciences, and finally the Idea of Beauty itself. Love is the agent which helps man in his travels along this road to the goal where all life should be spent and where man can be truly happy. Socrates through Diotima has seen this goal. He is one of the initiates; he wants forever to move towards that goal and finally to come to rest in it. But there is a converse to this ascent with Love, a descent or a fleeing away from the goal. It is implied in Socrates' speech in that a road up can conversely be traveled down. But the road down, the retreat from the Idea, can be best seen in Alcibiades' speech.

Alcibiades called Socrates a *daimon* (215 A). Unknowingly Alcibiades employs the same terms in the panegyric on Socrates as Socrates used when he described Love. He relates, for example, how Socrates was able to endure the hardships of winter campaigns with nothing on but his ordinary clothes and without anything on his feet (220 B). Socrates had earlier described Love as hard, weather-beaten, shoeless and homeless (203 D). As the *daimon* Love is in want, so is Socrates. But the similarity can be carried even further, for as Love wants always to move towards the beloved, the Idea, so Socrates wants always to move towards the Idea, as he himself stated:

Do you not see that in that region alone (the realm of Ideas) where he sees beauty with the faculty capable of seeing it, will



he be able to bring forth not mere reflected images of goodness but true goodness, because he will be in contact not with a reflection but with the truth? And having brought forth and nurtured true goodness he will have the privilege of being beloved of god, and becoming, if ever a man can, immortal himself. This . . . is what I . . . believe.<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, as Love at each stage of its ascent attempts to create in beauty, to inspire, to educate another, so Socrates wants to persuade others. However, in the relationship with Alcibiades such was not possible. The flaw lay with Alcibiades. He recognizes the daemonic quality of Socrates, and the fact that Socrates compels him to realize his imperfections and his neglect of himself, and that Socrates makes him ashamed (215 E ff.). But despite this awareness Alcibiades says that whenever he sees Socrates he takes refuge in flight. Like a runaway slave he takes to his heels because the temptations of popularity are too great (216 BC). Alcibiades runs away from Love. But his path is not simply away from Love, it is more importantly away from the realm of Ideas. He wilfully rejects any pursuit of beauty with Love. He goes, one may say, towards ugliness and indeed even evil. This point is made even clearer in the fact that Alcibiades unknowingly parodies the steps of the ascent to Beauty in describing the various stages of his attempted seduction of Socrates (210 A ff. and 217 A ff.). The attempt is a failure, for like the Idea Socrates is incorruptible, in a real way immovable. What Alcibiades does dramatically in the dialogue, then, is to lead away from the ideal, for he does not want it. That he stands in contrast to Socrates has often been noted. But more, he moves the dinner party away from its purpose. Plato emphasizes this downward movement by having a band of revellers enter at the conclusion of Alcibiades' speech and effectively destroy the mood of the party.

On an intellectual level the dinner

party has the same movement towards the ideal and away from it. The earlier speeches had been gropings towards a definition of Love. But they were partial and confused and in a sense aimless through a failure on the part of the speakers to understand the nature, power, and use of Love. But the failure also arose because of a lack of training for the perception of the goal of Love, a point Diotima insisted upon when she told Socrates he must go through preliminary instruction. Though each later speech makes an advance over an earlier one, it is not until Socrates' speech that the subject is properly defined and understood. Though each of the earlier speeches moves towards a definition of Love and the truth, that of Alcibiades moves away. He consciously rejects a panegyric on Love, choosing instead a panegyric on Socrates. The movement from the topic is strengthened when the revellers enter and the conversation degenerates into a carouse.

On a moral level the same pattern is evident. The earlier speakers are concerned with the lower stages in the ascent to the Idea, moving onwards from a pursuit of physical love. Socrates, again, shows the moral meaning of Love, and Alcibiades indicates the immoral pursuit. Socrates' moral incorruptibility which derives from his insight into the realm of Ideas is stressed again in the fact that sensuous pleasures are of no moment to him, for not only did he resist Alcibiades, but also he alone among the guests is able to remain awake and with a sober head in the midst of the drinking which follows the intrusion of the revellers.

One further point remains to be noted about the dinner party. From the time the flute girl leaves until Alcibiades enters there is no description of physical movement. Although there may be intellectual, moral, and even emotional movement, no one is

described as rising to speak, let alone as walking. The dinner is in a state of rest. But the repose of the dinner is ended with the drunken entrance of Alcibiades and completely demolished with the appearance of the revellers. It is as though the earlier portion of the party had achieved a condition similar to that of the Idea of Beauty. In Socrates' speech which contains Diotima's instruction, Plato's prose achieves an emotional height which benefits its subject matter and which suggests the Idea of Beauty. He has given us a momentary glimpse of the realm of Ideas.

This point leads back to the beginning of this paper, the construction of the entire dialogue. The banquet itself and particularly the Socrates-Diotima speech are symbols of the ideal towards which all who truly love are moving. They exist in comparison to the reporting of them in a state of rest. Like the Idea of Beauty they have the power of moving men. The dinner and the Socrates-Diotima speech are the central events, the one framing the other. They prompt others to hear about them. Though they are in a sense unmoving they compel movement towards them. In the opening scenes there is movement, literally a physical (Glaucón's run) as well as an intellectual one, to hear about the dinner party on the part of Apollodorus, Glaucón, and the unknown friend. At each step of our way to hear about the dinner we as readers are accompanied by another person who reports. Each of the reporters functions as Love functions, telling someone else, bringing to birth in beauty, educating another. Diotima edu-

icates Socrates; Socrates educates the rest of the dinner guests; one of them, Aristodemus, educates Apollodorus; Apollodorus, Glaucón and the friend; and so on until Plato educates us. Each is in a sense a *daímon* moving from the realm of Ideas to the realm of men. At the same time we as readers are invited to step into these conversations and move through them until we too reach Diotima's remarks and the significance of the Idea of Beauty.

Plato prepares us psychologically and aesthetically for the experience by insisting upon the varying frames and by stressing at crucial points the action of walking. This action is significant, for through such walking we are led to the ideal; we can see and perhaps understand it. Motion is a condition of mankind, rest an ideal, a goal, an end. The banquet has achieved an almost immortal quality, akin to that of the Idea of Beauty. The symposium which we know intellectually happened so far away and so long ago emotionally can still move men through Love to contemplate the goal of Love. Significantly we see Socrates, whom we understand as the perfect *erastés*, at the end of the dialogue walk away to rest. He may indeed be going home to rest, to bed, but Socrates who has seen and understood the true reality moves always to rest, to the eternal, to the divine, to the ideal.

State University of Iowa

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> R. G. Bury, *The Symposium of Plato* (Cambridge, Eng., 1932) pp. xx ff.

<sup>2</sup> 212 AB, trans. W. Hamilton (Penguin) p. 95.

# BOOK REVIEWS

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., EDITOR

*Studies in Ancient Greek Society, Vol. II: The First Philosophers.* By GEORGE THOMSON. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1955. Pp. 367.

THIS AND THE author's two previous works, *Studies in Ancient Greek Society, Vol. I: The Prehistoric Aegean* (2nd ed., 1954) and *Aeschylus and Athens* (2nd ed., 1946) occupy a special place in the bibliography of classical studies in English, for Thomson is a confirmed Marxist-Leninist who has used dialectical materialism in these works to interpret many aspects of the ancient world. Anyone who was intrigued by the excellent review of Soviet classical scholarship by Hugh F. Graham in a recent issue of *CJ* (51 [1955] 138-140) will find these books most interesting. It is worth noting in this connection that Thomson has recently given up his long held post as Professor of Greek in the University of Birmingham to join the faculty of the Charles University, Prague. To judge from the title of the volume under review, one would presume that the pre-Socratics and perhaps some of the later philosophers are the subject of examination in it, but there is much more to it than that. In fact, less than a tenth of the first 250 pages has anything to do with the Greek philosophers! We get instead a summary course in current Marxist-Leninist doctrine in biology, anthropology, economics, and sociology, in order to be prepared for a "correct" interpretation of Greek philosophy, or of anything else, for that matter. Learning as Pavlovian conditioning (this book is the very embodiment of this principle), the communism of all primitive societies, the significance of commodity production, and the inevitability of the class struggle are examples of the many topics treated in this somewhat extended prolegomenon. When the philosophers are finally reached, only the Milesians, Pythagoreans, Heraclitus, and Parmenides are given adequate space for discussion. All the rest down to and including Aristotle are hastily treated in the penultimate chapter of the book. In view of these facts it is plain to see where the author's real interests lie.

The general theme is that since the breakdown of primitive communism the structure and ideas of all civilizations have been determined by the degree to which commodity production has been developed in them. Commodity production in Marxism is the activity which alienates the worker from the product of his work by the creation of a market for exchange and a money economy. In this situation the worker becomes victimized by those who gain control of the distribution and sale of his production. Guided by this standard doctrine Thomson advances the thesis that ancient thought in the course of this social failure passed from a vital primitive materialism to an effete philosophical idealism. It is an easy step from here to his conclusion that this process of decay is at last being reversed by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the Soviet application of them. In general, the author's technique has been to get many of his facts from standard research works on classical antiquity and then to interpret these findings in the light of the holy writings of Communist orthodoxy. The bibliography not only lists the works of classicists such as Cornford, Nilsson, and Harrison, but it also includes the writings of such polymaths as K. Marx, F. Engels, V. I. Lenin, J. V. Stalin, and Mao Tse-tung. Unaccountably Chou En-lai is missing. This oversight will be corrected, no doubt, in the promised third volume of *Studies*, which is to be a comparative examination of Greek and Chinese philosophy.

Thomson likes to use the views of a classicist which can most easily be revised to fit the needs of his argument (e.g., pp. 188-194). By rebukes ranging from mild to stern he then cleverly blurs the distinctions between the scholar and the propagandist in correcting what he considers obviously mistaken ideas. Occasionally the mask of sweet reasonableness is dropped, as when he is faced with these words of Westermann (p. 204) on slavery in Greece: "In any sense which implies either that the enslaved population predominated over the free or that the Greek city-states displayed the mentality of a slave-ridden society, Greek society was

not founded on slavery." Now the role of slavery in the ancient world is an essential feature of the Marxian outlook on history, for in this dispensation it was the mode of exploitation characteristic of ancient society, just as serfdom later was that of feudal society and wage labor is that of modern capitalism. Therefore to counter Westermann he turns to a statement by Marx on the false notions held by any exploiting class about economic realities. Next follows what he considers the various kinds of rationalization by the Athenians in the face of the institution of legalized slavery. He then concludes that, "This, like the similar sophistries put forward by white settlers and their descendants in Africa and America today . . . proves nothing except the capacity of an exploiting class to deceive itself." This statement in itself is really proof of something else—of the crudity, wilful distortion, and, perhaps most important, the self-deception of Communist propaganda.

Before going on to Thomson's treatment of the philosophers I am compelled to make a few comments on certain Marxian first principles used in this book since they are so essential to the argument. The appeal of Marxism lies in the deceptive simplicity of certain of its basic concepts which can be applied to almost any era of history with apparent justification. Given these tools the Communist historian can have it both ways in his criticism of other societies, for human history will never see the day when injustices, economic or otherwise, are unknown. Safe in the naive conviction that Marxism is the universal solvent, however, the Communist writer can excoriate the failings of other civilizations while suppressing factors which may far outweigh any real shortcomings. Constitutional guarantees, for example, can be treated as mere fictions; social advances as meaningless concessions of an oppressive oligarchy; great works of literature as documents of a tyranny or as a reflection of the suppressed masses' hope in the dialectics of history. As someone has pointed out, given Marxian premises, even the Sermon on the Mount can be treated as evidence of depressed economic conditions in first century Palestine! In view of all this it is necessary to observe that the Marxian emphasis on the class struggle in history ignores the other side of the coin, class co-operation and solidarity. Collaboration between classes, in fact, is normal. The divergencies between economic groups are transcended by the higher common good, since

all parties benefit by the continuation of production (see R. N. Carew Hunt, *Marxism: Past and Present*, pp. 84-90, which includes some interesting comments on the Marxian failure to prove its case concerning the decline and fall of Rome).

Again, the view that all primitive societies were communistic in their origins is nothing more than an unproven theory which Thomson makes no serious attempt to document. Lastly, the emphasis on the role of commodity production and exchange in all non-Communist societies is a simplistic interpretation in which psychological, historical, social, and geographical factors are either ignored, disparaged, or transmuted. One of the results of this monomania is the elimination of all mysteries and problems from the human condition. Moral evil, for example, simply becomes the result of the alienation of the worker from his production and his consequent exploitation in the class struggle.

The Milesians are described by the author as primitive materialists, an easy task in view of their cosmological interests. The Pythagoreans are then represented as beginning a transition toward idealism, "a philosophy founded on the denial of motion and change and hence of life itself." They are seen as members of a middle class which arose through the development of commodity production within an economy previously primitive and agrarian. This developing polarity between materialist and idealist is most dramatically represented by contrasting the positions of Heraclitus and Parmenides in successive chapters, and it is in an examination of his treatment of these two that Thomson's method is best seen. Heraclitus as a proponent of universal change has been a favorite of Marxians since the time of Lenin. We are first given Frag. 51, on the opposing tensions in the bow and the lyre, as proof that he believes "the world is held together, not by fusion, but by tension, not by harmony, but by strife." (p. 272). Thomson's key word here is *strife*, which by a piece of semantic trickery is treated as a synonym for *tension*. In Heraclitus this latter (*palintonos harmonia*) refers to the countervailing pulls existing between the frame and the string in a bow or lyre (see G. S. Kirk, *Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments*, pp. 202-221, for a full and excellent discussion of this and the related Frag. 8). Next comes the famous and much misunderstood Frag. 53: "War is the father of all and lord of all, and has made gods and men, freemen and slaves." The

author would have us believe that this statement is significant because in its last phrase it reveals Heraclitus' awareness of the class struggle (see Kirk, *Heraclitus*, pp. 245-249 for a balanced discussion of this fragment). With these two interpretations Thomson is content to rest his case that Heraclitus really was a proto-Marxian. The remainder of the chapter is given over to an examination of the conditions which are supposed to have made this possible.

Thomson naturally has trouble with the monism of Parmenides, who first developed (p. 292) "a metaphysical conception of being, contradicting the dialectical conception of becoming, which had hitherto prevailed without question" (italics by Thomson). Parmenides is therefore saddled with the prime responsibility for turning ancient philosophy from the path of materialism to the inanities of idealism. Not until Hegel, if we listen to Thomson, would things begin to improve. "The Parmenidean One represents the earliest attempt to formulate the idea of 'substance'—an idea which was developed by Plato and Aristotle, but only brought to maturity in modern times by bourgeois philosophers" (p. 300). Without any arguments or documentation the writer concludes that the monism of Parmenides and the later development of the idea of substance are attributable to a "false consciousness" in which unreal categories of thought were derived from civilization's increasing tendency to view commodity values as absolutes. Thomson is wise in only formulating this anachronism of Marxian jargon and in not attempting to defend it. Presumably he feels that any catechumen who has managed to stay with him for 300 pages is not likely to balk so late in the game at so modest a proposal. He does, however, leave himself an exit by stating that although he considers this view provisional he also thinks of it as most probable. But in the case of Parmenides alone, to examine the matter no further, Thomson will have to make use of this retreat in the light of the following facts. By rejecting the Heraclitean thesis that a thing can be and not be, Parmenides discovered the Law of Contradiction, a first principle of formal logic. Now in accordance with classical Marxian doctrine Thomson attacks formal logic in a number of passages (esp. p. 280) because it is immutable, i.e., "non-dialectical." Unfortunately for him, however, he seems unaware that as long ago as 1947 such doctrinaire attacks on traditional formal

logic ceased abruptly in the Soviet Union by an order of the Central Committee of the C. P. for its rehabilitation. Since that time this field has received considerable and, on balance, favorable attention from Soviet scholars (see George L. Kline, "A Philosophical Critique of Soviet Marxism," *The Rev. of Metaphysics* 9 [1955-1956] 95-96 and esp. the references in n. 10).

Because of the *a priori* necessities of his ideological strait jacket, the author is forced to take a dim view of Greek philosophy after Parmenides. For example, Plato's philosophy "expresses the reactionary outlook of a selfish oligarchy clinging blindly to its privileges at a time when their social and economic basis was crumbling away," and the Aristotelian "First Mover is an ideological expression of the ownership of the homogeneous slave labour embodied in ancient commodity production." But the ultimate evidence of the author's *hubris* comes when he quotes the *Magnificat* in full (p. 333) as a revelation of the suppressed masses' sense of the dialectics of the class struggle!

In conclusion, this book is already dated in part by the recent attacks of the Kremlin on Stalin and all he represented. Among other things this indicates that Soviet scholars will soon be free to drop or revise much that is outmoded in Marxism. It will therefore be most interesting to compare this book with Thomson's promised third volume when it appears. One thing seems certain—the Heraclitean concept of flux will be much in evidence therein.

KEVIN HERBERT

Bowdoin College

*Eternal Egypt.* By CLEMENT ROBICHON and ALEXANDRE VARILLE. Translated by Laetitia Gifford. New York: The Philosophical Library, Inc., 1955. Pp. xv, 144. Ill. \$6.00.

AMID THE CURRENT flood of picture books about Egypt, this one is outstanding due to the originality, variety, and range of the photographs. Most of the war-horses that one has come to expect in a book of this kind have been omitted, and unavoidable pictures, such as the general view of the temple of Karnak, have at least been taken from a new angle.

The authors' aim has differed from that of most compilers of such books. We have here a definite attempt to show the totality and continuity of life in Egypt, with the exception of the influence of the modern West. The book ranges from the monu-



ments of the ancients to the daily life of their present-day successors, from the cemeteries of Memphis to those of modern Cairo, which still continue in the same tradition despite two changes of religion. The geography of Egypt, the ancient ruins, modern villages, and cities are all represented.

It is hard to single out pictures for special mention. Some which seem to be of interest as illustrating aspects not generally met with in such books are: the view from the modern, city-like cemetery of Cairo across the Nile Valley to the pyramids of Giza (plate 5), a view of the unspectacular type of ruin that forms the bulk of the remains of ancient Egypt (plate 27), or a view of the Egyptian rural landscape for once unencumbered by the picturesque (plate 31). One could add perhaps the pyramids of Giza dwarfed by the vast expanse of the desert (plate 22), the beehive cemetery at Zāwiyet el-Meitin (plate 43), or the saddle-shaped tombs at Nag' Hamadi (plate 48). The aerial view of the border between the Nile Valley and the desert on plate 46 is an excellent illustration of a much-stated fact. The list could be continued indefinitely.

Inevitably, there are a few flies in the ointment. The authors' views on the function and symbolic nature of the Egyptian temple have hardly found acceptance among scholars and might have been left out of a book intended for non-specialists. There are certain weaknesses in the translation. Perhaps the worst is the rendering of a presumed original "cynocéphale" (baboon) by "dog-headed figure" (p. xv). The aerial view of the pyramids of Giza on the dust-cover would have been less confusing to the reviewer if the photograph hadn't been reversed.

But these are minor faults in a book which can be heartily recommended to anyone desiring to get a balanced picture of the countryside and monuments of Egypt.

KLAUS BAER

Chicago

ALAMANNO RINUCCINI, *Lettere ed orazioni*, a cura di VITO R. GIUSTINIANI. ("Nuova Collezione di Testi Umanistici Inediti o Rari," IX.) Firenze: Olschki, 1953. Pp. xliii, 265. L. 2500.

THIS VOLUME contains all the extant Humanistic writings of Rinuccini with the exception of his *Dialogus de libertate* and

his translations from the Greek. A large part of the contents is taken from a manuscript in Ravenna discovered by the editor, and is now printed for the first time.

Rinuccini was not one of the major Humanists of the Fifteenth Century; in comparison with his eminent friends, Pontanus and Filelfo, he was minor indeed. He was an intelligent, studious, and amiable man, who, lacking fortune and disdaining patronage, lived on the margin of the Humanistic movement rather than in it. But for our reconstruction of the beginnings of modern intellectual history, even a relatively mediocre man has his value; it is significant, for example, to find him (p. 108) conscious of the Renaissance as a rebirth of antiquity, and of the restoration of correct Latin as its major function, on which the other activities of the human mind, which he by no means overlooks, are made to depend.

Of the various pieces in this book, some of which are inconsequential letters or orations filled with the vacuous courtesies that are the stock in trade of diplomacy in all ages, the general reader will be most interested in three. There is an interesting essay (xvii) which recounts, judiciously but with unconcealed admiration, the career of Stefano Porcari, who, rapt with dreams of ancient glories, in 1453 followed in the footsteps of the more famous Cola di Rienzo and sought to convince the motley and mongrel crowd in the Roman streets that they were the descendants and heirs of Brutus and Cassius. A long letter on education (xxx), which Rinuccini wrote for the guidance of his own son, fairly represents the opinions of cultivated men who were neither teachers nor professional men of letters, and is noteworthy for its insistence on Humanistic studies as the unique means of attaining the prudence and wisdom requisite for rational participation in the world's affairs. And the preface (xxxii) to Rinuccini's translation of Philostratus' life of Apollonius gives a concise account of the new Renaissance culture in art, architecture, and politics, as well as literature. The other writings are relatively unimportant, but few are devoid of interest. A dozen letters, for example, deal with the newly founded University of Pisa, and we may note that Rinuccini (lxiii) opposed the establishment of a professorship of astrology, the fashionable and obviously practical "social science" of his day.

REVILO P. OLIVER

University of Illinois



*The Aeneid of Vergil.* Newly translated with an Introduction by KEVIN GUINAGH. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1953 (second printing, 1954). Pp. xxxii, 351. Paper cover, \$0.75.

IN THESE DAYS when even our most literate college graduates have small Latin and less Greek, it is heartening to see that there are still many lovers of literature who will not let the Classics die. Inexpensive paper-covered editions of Greek and Latin writers in translation continue to appear in the book stores to supply the wants of the general reader, and this new translation of the *Aeneid* has taken an honorable place among them. Dr. Guinagh has produced a book in clear and simple English well within the grasp of the non-specialist adult reader, and suitable also, as he undoubtedly intended it to be (see p. xiii), for the serious high school student who wants to read the poem to the end in English while working slowly through three or four books of the original in a Latin class.

A tidy introduction in twenty-one pages tells the reader what he needs to know about Roman history, the works of Vergil, the background of the story, and the character of Aeneas. With these essential facts in mind, and with occasional glances back at a well-drawn map (pp. xiv-xv) showing the wanderings of the Trojans, he can make his way intelligently through a readable modern prose translation of the *Aeneid*. When he is puzzled by proper names, he can refer to the glossary, pp. 337-351, where he will find the pertinent facts about persons and places judiciously compiled. For the more studious reader, there is a select list (pp. xxv-xxvii) of important books in English. In this list the only serious omission I have noticed is *Vergil's Latium* by Bertha Tilly, which on many points supercedes Saunders' *Vergil's Primitive Italy* recommended here to the general reader.

Brief introductions, summing up complicated facts in a simple way for the less advanced student are almost bound to dissatisfy the specialist in places. It is not surprising, then, to find in Dr. Guinagh's otherwise admirable introduction one paragraph that is unhappily confused and misleading. On p. xxi, the author quite rightly reminds us that Vergil did not literally believe in the gods and goddesses as pictured in the poem, but then he goes on to indicate the influence of Lucretius, and he seems to imply that Vergil had not turned

from the Epicureanism of his youth by the time that he started the *Aeneid*. But surely the mind of the poet of the *Aeneid* is radically opposed to that of Lucretius. In the *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius wishes to free men from fear by showing that the gods have no concern for man and his world and by proving that man's soul perishes with his body and has no future life to worry about. Vergil, on the other hand, pictures a world ruled by a divine Power to which man must be subject, and in the most solemn and impressive passage at the very center of the whole poem he very clearly indicates his belief in a future life where crime is punished and virtue is rewarded. There are, of course, numerous lines in the *Aeneid* that echo the *De Rerum Natura*, but Vergil has gone beyond the atomistic system that had captivated his youthful mind to an eclectic religious philosophy compounded of Stoicism and Platonism joined to a deep and tender spirit of old Roman piety. Dr. Guinagh himself seems to recognize all this when, at the end of the same paragraph (p. xxi), he alludes to the doctrine of the world soul propounded by Anchises in Book Six. Perhaps in a future revision the author will be able to make his position clearer.

The style of the translation has the merit of being straightforward and up-to-date. The translator has avoided Wardour Street English and produced a work that reads almost like a modern novel. We may wish at times for a more poetic diction, a more effective word order, a more harmonious rhythm, a more elevated and inspiring tone, but we may console ourselves with the thought that the very plainness of style will induce many a young reader, who might be frightened away by a poetic and ornate rendering, to read the poem through to the end. There are passages, however, where the translator seems unnecessarily to have tied himself down to a method too literal. Thus Aeneas is said to have raised his two "palms" to the stars (1. 93) and Mercury to have flown down on an "oarage" of wings (1. 301). A more vigorous and spirited rendering might have been produced by the elimination of many abstract nouns in such phrases as: "these miserable disasters" for *quae miserrima* (2. 5); "with a great show of affection" for *miro amore* (7. 57); and "after considering many possibilities" for *multa movens animo* (10. 890). The translation in general seems to be accurate, but I noticed the following slips: "voices were

continuously heard" for *continuo auditae voces* (6. 426); "a worthy son who might have been happier under his father's command except that Mezentius hardly treated him as a father should" for *dignus patriis qui laetior esset / imperiis et cui pater haud Mezentius esset* (7. 653-654); and "he ordered his companions . . . to fit their courage to their weapons" for *sociis edicit . . . animos aptent armis* (10. 258-259). The only irregularity in the handling of proper names is Julius for Iulus. The latter, based on the scansion of the word in Vergil, is generally accepted by English translators.

But in spite of these few strictures, this work on the whole has genuine merit, and a teacher of the Classics can only hope that it will serve to introduce Vergil to a wider audience. It is an attractive book to look at and handle. A drawing representing some mythological figure connected with the story is placed before each of the twelve books, and scattered throughout the text are frequent subheads that sum up the action in each section and guide the reader through the narrative.

JOHN HAMMOND TAYLOR, S.J.  
St. Francis Xavier Novitiate  
Sheridan, Oregon

*Caesar: Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars.* Translated by A. G. WAX. (Loeb Classical Library No. 402.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1955. Pp. xiv, 426; six maps. \$3.00.

CAESAR'S LITERARY reputation depends primarily on the seven books of *Commentaries on the Gallic War*, which were written by him in his winter-quarters after the fall of Alesia and the end of the Arvernian revolt. He wrote with the same ease and speed which characterized his movements in war. A staff-officer later added the eighth book to the *Commentaries*, and thus completed the story of Caesar's proconsulate in Gaul. The *Commentaries on the Civil War* were published after Caesar's death, and probably owe their final revision to one or more of his officers.

The three works which constitute the volume under review are of uncertain authorship. If Hirtius wrote the eighth book of the *Gallic Wars*, he may well be the author of the *Alexandrian War* also, for the style of the two works is quite similar. The author of the *African War* was doubtless an eye-witness of the events he describes,

## READ LIKE A ROMAN

Latin students get off to a good start with Tutor reading filmstrips to supplement their first textbook, USING LATIN, BOOK ONE.

This dynamic Tutor teaching aid highlights the language patterns of Latin, helps students form correct, natural reading habits right from the beginning. Group attention is focused on single points for complete, easy teacher control. An excellent reviewing device, Tutor filmstrips permit repetition without boredom.

By special arrangement with Scott, Foresman & Co., these popular 35 mm. filmstrips have been expertly edited linguistically by Waldo E. Sweet, of the University of Michigan. You can order them directly from the workshop of Richard H. Walker, first to create and publish recordings and readings filmstrips for your Latin classroom.

### ORDER FORM

Send the USING LATIN filmstrips checked:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 1-9   | 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 55-61  |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 10-18 | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 62-66  |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 19-26 | 10. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 67-72 |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 27-33 | 11. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 73-78 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 34-40 | 12. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 79-83 |
| 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 41-47 | 13. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 84-88 |
| 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 48-54 | 14. <input type="checkbox"/> Lessons 89-95 |

Individual strips at \$3.00—Complete Set \$40.00

Teacher's Manual \$1.00—Free with Complete Set

Enclosed find payment of \$..... for..... filmstrips.

Send Complete Set and charge school. ☐

Name .....

Position .....

School .....

City ..... State.....

**TUTOR THAT NEVER TIRES, INC.**  
RICHARD H. WALKER, Pres.  
8 Masterton Road  
BRONXVILLE, NEW YORK

but he was neither a historian nor a literary artist; he wrote with more enthusiasm than skill. The *Spanish War* is probably the most deplorable book extant in all Latin literature, and the sorry state of the text, on which the great Mommsen wasted a great deal of time which he might have devoted to more fruitful labors, only adds to the reader's bewilderment. The author was doubtless a soldier who had participated in this, the bloodiest of all of Caesar's campaigns. His quotations from Ennius show that he was a man of some education, and that he remembered well the lessons of his youth, when Ennius was still the standard textbook. Nevertheless, it would seem that his hand was more adept with the sword than with the stylus. The great prose of the Golden Age came to a sudden and speedy end when civil strife pushed the educated governing class out of office, and exalted Caesar's subalterns to high positions. Soon cultured men turned more and more to the employment of the Greek tongue in their writing of prose. The reader of the *Spanish War* may justly feel that he has been present at the assassination and interment of Golden Age prose.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

**WILLIAM H. ALLEN**

**BOOKSELLER**

2031 WALNUT STREET

PHILADELPHIA 3, PA.

**BOOKS IN  
LATIN & GREEK**

and

works relating to

classical antiquity

bought and sold

*Send for free catalog*

Two leading texts REVISED...

**FIRST YEAR LATIN by Smith and Thompson**

**SECOND YEAR LATIN by Scudder**

Revised by Charles Jenney, Jr.

Here is latin at its best . . . superlative illustrations (both color as well as black and white), new maps, brand new formats, vocabulary lists revised to meet latest Secondary and State Education

Examinations, and a workbook prepared especially for Second Year Latin. Teachers' Manuals accompany both texts and workbooks.

**ALLYN and BACON, Inc.**

Boston 8 — New York 11 — Chicago 7 — Atlanta 3 — Dallas 2 — San Francisco 5



Help more students get more out of Latin with

## USING LATIN

BY JOHN F. GUMMERE AND ANNABEL HORN

### USING LATIN I

Attainment Tests  
Teacher's Guidebook

### USING LATIN II

Attainment Tests  
Teacher's Guidebook

### USING LATIN III

Attainment Tests  
(in preparation)  
Teacher's Guidebook

## SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago 11    Atlanta 5    Dallas 2    Palo Alto    Fair Lawn, N. J.

*These books give LIFE to Latin!*

## LATIN AND THE ROMANS

Jenkins  
Wagener

### NEW EDITION

#### *Sales Offices:*

New York 11  
Chicago 6  
Atlanta 3  
Dallas 1  
Columbus 16  
San Francisco 3  
Toronto 7

*Home Office:*  
Boston

While teaching Latin clearly and thoroughly, these two books present an interesting panorama of the colorful days of Rome's greatness and the lives and customs of the ancient Romans. BOOK I introduces Latin in a simple and natural way, with units on various aspects of Roman life. BOOK II offers selections from Vergil's *Aeneid*, Caesar's *Commentaries*, Livy and other Latin writers. The Teachers' Manual covers both books. Handsomely illustrated.

*Please Ask for Descriptive Circular*

## GINN AND COMPANY

two  
ful  
of  
a  
cts  
It  
in  
ks.

Y